

ED 024 693

24

TE 001 061

By- Bogard, Travis, Ed.

International Conference on Theatre Education and Development: A Report on the Conference Sponsored by AETA (State Department, Washington, D.C., June 14-18, 1967).

Spons Agency- American Educational Theatre Association, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Bureau No- BR-7-0783

Pub Date Aug 68

Grant- OEG-1-7-070783-1713

Note- 128p.

Available from- AETA Executive Office, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. (HC-\$2.00).

Journal Cit- Educational Theatre Journal; v20 n2A Aug 1968 Special Issue

EDRS Price MF-\$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors- Acoustical Environment, *Acting, Audiences, Auditoriums, Creative Dramatics, Drama, Dramatic Play, *Dramatics, Education, Facilities, Fine Arts, Playwriting, *Production Techniques, Speech, *Speech Education, *Theater Arts, Theaters

The conference reported here was attended by educators and theater professionals from 24 countries, grouped into five discussion sections. Summaries of the proceedings of the discussion groups, each followed by postscripts by individual participants who wished to amplify portions of the summary, are presented. The discussion groups and the editors of their discussions are: "Training Theatre Personnel," Ralph Allen; "Theatre and Its Developing Audience," Francis Hodge; "Developing and Improving Artistic Leadership," Brooks McNamara; "Theatre in the Education Process," O. G. Brockett; and "Improving Design for the Technical Function: Scenography, Structure and Function," Richard Schechner. A final section, "Soliloquies and Passages-at-Arms," contains selected transcriptions from audio tapes of portions of the conference. (JS)

Educational
Theatre Journal

BR 7-0783
PA-24

EDO 24693

*Special
Issue*

**INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE
ON
THEATRE EDUCATION
AND
DEVELOPMENT**

TE 001 061



August 1968

Educational
Theatre Journal

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
on
THEATRE EDUCATION
and
DEVELOPMENT

A Report on the Conference Sponsored by AETA
State Department, Washington, D. C.
June 14-18, 1967

TRAVIS BOGARD
General Editor

Copyright 1968 by the American Educational Theatre Association, Inc., except for the material on pp. ii-xiv and 249-362, inclusive which was produced under Contract OEG-1-7-070783-1713 in cooperation with the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare



THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE REPORTED HEREIN WAS INITIATED BY IRVING BROWN, Theatre Education Specialist of the Arts and Humanities Program, U. S. Office of Education and was sponsored by the American Educational Theatre Association. This report is therefore published as a Special Issue of *Educational Theatre Journal* because its content should be of specific interest to the full membership. As the following pages show, Jack Morrison served as Co-Chairman of the Conference along with Augustin Siré; H. B. Menagh of AETA's Washington Office provided the many special services needed to operate the Conference; and the State Department loaned its discussion room facilities along with its communication equipment and expert translators.

This report has been prepared by Travis Bogard, General Editor. Technical assistance in publication was given by Francis Hodge, editor of *ETJ*.

Extra copies beyond this printing of this Special Issue of *ETJ* may be purchased from the AETA Executive Office, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D. C. Price: \$2.00

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the provisions of the Cooperative Research Program. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Contract No. OEG-1-7-070783-1713

ETJ is included in the Education Index

Published March, May, October, and December by the American Educational Theatre Association, Inc., Executive Office, at the John F. Kennedy Center, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20566. Printed by the Artcraft Press, 310 Watson Place, Columbia, Missouri 65201.

Memberships in the American Educational Theatre Association include subscriptions to the *Educational Theatre Journal*. Membership inquiries should be addressed to the Executive Office. Library subscriptions are \$10.00 per year, \$18.00 for two years, \$26.00 for three years. Single copies are \$2.50 to Association members, \$3.00 to non-members. Inquiries about advertising, circulation, and subscriptions should be addressed to the Managing Editor, AETA Executive Office, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20566.

Manuscripts should be sent to the Editor, Dr. Francis Hodge, Department of Drama, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712, with an addressed and stamped envelope for return. All manuscripts should conform to the MLA Style Sheet. Contributors desiring reprints of articles appearing in the *Journal* should communicate with Artcraft Press no less than fifteen days before the date of issue.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C., and additional mailing offices.

Contents

Foreword	v
Charge to the Conference by Jack Morrison	vii
Greeting to the Conference from Vice President Hubert Humphrey	viii
Program and Participants	ix-xiii

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Group I: Training Theatre Personnel	249
RALPH ALLEN, <i>Editor</i>	

Postscripts

RENÉ HAINAUX: <i>Plea for a Methodology</i>	255
M. TSAREV: <i>The Education of Technicians in the U.S.S.R.</i>	257
DUNCAN ROSS: <i>Towards an Organic Approach to Actor Training: A Criticism of the Stanislavski Scheme</i>	258

Group II: Theatre and Its Developing Audience	269
FRANCIS HODGE, <i>Editor</i>	

Postscripts

MILAN LUKES: <i>A Statement</i>	278
AARON FRANKEL: <i>A Statement</i>	281
FERENC HONT: <i>Theatre and Public in Hungary</i>	282

Group III: Developing and Improving Artistic Leadership	291
BROOKS MCNAMARA, <i>Editor</i>	

Postscripts

REYNALDO D'AMORE: <i>The Peruvian Theatrical Movement</i>	297
---	-----

Group IV: Theatre in the Education Process	299
O. G. BROCKETT, <i>Editor</i>	

Postscripts

RYOICHI NAKAGAWA: <i>Theatre Education in Japan</i>	302
HANS MICHAEL RICHTER: <i>Theatre Education in the German Democratic Republic (East Germany)</i>	303
MEHDI FOROUGH: <i>Theatre Education in Iran</i>	305
IN HYUNG YOO: <i>Theatre Education in Korea</i>	305

H. D. SUGATHAPALA: <i>Theatre Education in Ceylon</i>	306
CECILE GUIDOTE: <i>Theatre Education in The Philippines</i>	307
OKOT p'BITEK: <i>Theatre Education in Uganda</i>	308
VERA MOWRY ROBERTS: <i>Theatre Education in the United States</i>	308
 Group V: Improving Design for the Technical Function:	
Scenography, Structure and Function	311
RICHARD SCHECHNER, <i>Editor</i>	
 <i>Postscripts</i>	
GARY W. GAISER: <i>A Statement</i>	316
K. KOIZUMI: <i>A Statement</i>	318
ARTHUR RISSER: <i>A Statement</i>	319
WIM VESSEUR: <i>A Statement</i>	320
 SOLILOQUIES AND PASSAGES-AT-ARMS	
<i>A Note on the Transcriptions</i> by TRAVIS BOGARD	321
 <i>From Group I:</i>	
In which Mr. Duncan Ross, M. René Hainaux, Mr. Mikail Tsarev and Mr. Arthur Lithgow, among others, debate the Stanislavski Sys- tem, <i>Cheironomia</i> , the lassitude of American acting and other matters relevant to the integration of actor training	322
 <i>From Group II:</i>	
<i>The Theatre of the Rhinoceros</i> and <i>The Theatre as a Star</i> : defini- tions evolving from a discussion by Messrs. Lukes, Beckerman, Frankel, and Mitra	329
 <i>From Group III:</i>	
<i>The Sense of the Ghetto in American Negro Theatre</i> , a debate between Mr. Edmonds, M. Darcante, Mr. Gister, Mr. Alkazi, and Mr. Beltzer	333
<i>A Theatre for the 5000-Year-Ago Woman</i> : a soliloquy by Mr. Alkazi	335
 <i>From Group V:</i>	
<i>Theatre and Variations</i> : an ardent dialogue between Messrs. Schechner, Tovstonogov, Spaic, Hoffman, and Gaiser	340
<i>Technology, the Actor and the Word</i>	347
Wim Vesseur propounds a heresy	352
<i>Technology and the Death of Heroes</i>	353
<i>Technology in the Age of Analysis</i> , a meditation by Mr. Kosta Spaic	358
 Discussion of the Dialogue, An Overview of the Conference by JACK MORRISON	360

Foreword

THEATRE IS A MACHINE DESIGNED TO ELICIT, THROUGH ARTIFICIAL STIMULATION, genuine commitment. Like any machine, it is subject to breakdown, repair, modification and restyling. Sometimes, but not often, it must be wholly redesigned in order that it may fulfill its function efficiently. Under capacity performance, it has uses at which men marvel. In it, men may totally annihilate space and time. They may metamorphose themselves and the visible shape of things. They may use it to x-ray matter and spirit. It can serve as an assassin's rifle or as a compass pointing to God. It may become a microscope of despair or a megaphone of celebration. It can, at times, generate the rare light of true laughter.

The kind and quality of commitment which the machine calls forth is the *raison d'être* of theatre. When the response is minimal, audience and actor are forced into the situation typically devised in science fiction as men are taken over by machines. When the response is full, it approximates one of the greatest satisfactions to which man in the mass may attain.

The quality of experience which lies in the creation and perception of theatre throughout the world was the implicit subject of the International Conference on Theatre Education and Development, held in Washington, D. C., from June 14 to 18, 1967. The conference, sponsored by the American Educational Theatre Association with funds provided by the United States Office of Education through its Arts and Humanities Program was held in the wake of the International Theatre Institute Congress in New York City. Present at the Washington conference were delegates from twenty-four countries, grouped into five discussion sections.

For four days, distinguished educators and theatre professionals discussed freely and at leisure matters concerning Education and Theatre: the education of students for the theatre, the education of audiences by the theatre, and the development through education of the theatre itself. What is here set down does not begin to reflect the sincerity and the sympathy of the international dialogue. The "official" languages of the conference were English and French, but it is no exaggeration to say that all the participants spoke a common tongue—the language of their commitment to the theatrical machine.

Each of the Discussion Groups was chaired by a North American who was aided by an Editor. The bulk of this report is the summary by each editor of the proceedings of his group. Many of the participants desired to add to the report fuller position statements, or amplifications of what appeared overly reduced in *précis* in the group reports. These have been appended as postscripts to the reports.

The second half of the Proceedings consists of a selection from the tapes made during each session. It is here, perhaps, that a reader can approach most closely to the quality of the conference. Here, for example, Mr. Sombhu Mitra describes a moment during an Indian famine when his theatre achieved a special relevance to the starving audiences. Here, M. René Hainaux inveighs against the lassitude of American actors, and Mr. Gyorgi Tovstonogov calls Mr. Richard Schechner a schizophrenic. Here, Mr. Randolph Edmonds rejects the idea of a ghetto theatre for the American negro, and Mr. Kosta Spaic suggests some of the problems of technology in an Age of Analysis.

Here, in other words, the delegates speak for themselves. The heart of the matter was the talk and it has not entirely survived cardiac transplantation into prose. What is here is only an index of a profitable dialogue carried on by men and women wholly devoted to their subject.

TRAVIS BOGARD
General Editor

Charge to the Conference

YOU ARE MOST WELCOME TO WASHINGTON AND OUR CONFERENCE, AND I AM PLEASED to charge you with the engaging task of sharing views with your colleagues assembled here this afternoon. Your thoughts about concepts, techniques and methods used in the theatre are of concern to us all. And the opportunity to hear, challenge, and compare your ideas in the interests of developing education in theatre more effectively is a vital one. If we use this opportunity well, the outcomes can serve to make significant contributions to both educational and professional theatre. Further, we can use our discussions to bring educational and professional theatre more closely together, as well as help both drive more speedily towards excellence.

As you have seen from the special issue (November, 1966) of the *Educational Theatre Journal*, "Relationships between Educational Theatre and Professional Theatre," we are at present in the throes of developing a new relationship between these two aspects of theatre in the U.S.A. Don't hesitate to question the North Americans about this problem. They welcome your inquiry and suggestions.

The five topics, *Training Theatre Personnel*, *Theatre and its Developing Audience*, *Developing and Improving Artistic Leadership*, *Theatre in the Education Process* and *Improving Design for the Theatrical Function: Scenography, Structure and Function*, arose from a discussion involving both professional and educational theatre leaders. We felt that these topics promise to set off the dialogue around critical issues. Your assignment to one of these topics was determined according to your request if you made one. Otherwise, the assignment is quite arbitrary, and you may wish to change your group. In any case, I ask you to begin with your assigned group and then, if you deem it appropriate, make your change through your chairman. It is also possible that your group may wish to modify or change its topic. This is perfectly permissible, provided your group has exhausted the original topic to its satisfaction.

Again I charge you to exchange views in the interest of discovering knowledge which will serve both educational and professional theatre and to meet that charge freely and imaginatively—to enjoy the pursuit of discovery in our confrontation. The results will be reported as essays by your editors, and will be published and sent to you.

Now I would like to introduce my co-chairman. Last summer I had the pleasure of meeting Augustin Siré in Santiago de Chile and of becoming acquainted with his remarkable professional company, ITUCH, which works within the University of Chile. Accordingly, it was a special pleasure for me to invite him to be my co-chairman here in North America as a representative of our foreign guests. May I present the distinguished actor and director—Augustin Siré.

Finally, I wish to thank Rosamond Gilder, the President of the International Theatre Institute and Elden Elder of AIDART whose interest and help in getting you here was invaluable.

JACK MORRISON
Conference Chairman

*A Message to the Conference from Vice President Hubert Humphrey:
A Telegram read to the Opening Session*

EDUCATION IN THEATRE ARTS HOLDS MEANING TO ONE WORLD FAR GREATER THAN EVEN THE BROAD WORLD OF FOOTLIGHTS, OF BACKSTAGE AND OF CLASSROOM. PLEASE CONVEY MY WARMEST WELCOME TO THE DISTINGUISHED PARTICIPANTS FROM OVERSEAS WHO WILL SHARE IN THE FRUITFUL DIALOGUE WITH YOUR ABLE COLLEAGUES OF AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL THEATRE. THE CONFERENCE'S HELPFUL DISCUSSIONS WILL ENHANCE YOUR RESPECTIVE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE LIVING STAGE, AND YOU WILL REFINE YOUR ARTISTIC EXPRESSION OF OUR HERITAGE OF THE STAGE AND OF TODAY'S AND TOMORROW'S EXPERIMENTAL ASPIRATIONS.

KINDEST REGARDS

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
VICE PRESIDENT
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PROGRAM AND PARTICIPANTS

International Conference on Theatre Education and Development

State Department, Washington, D. C., June 14-18, 1968

Purpose

To exchange views with international theatre leaders on concepts, techniques, and methods in the theatre in the interest of discovering knowledge which may be useful in developing education in theatre more effectively and in bringing both educational and professional theatre more speedily towards excellence.

This Conference is supported by Contract #OEG-1-7-070783-1713 with the U. S. Office of Education. Initiated by the Arts and Humanities Program of the Office, this Conference enjoyed the interest, support and counsel of its Director, Miss Kathryn Bloom and her Theatre Education Specialist, Dr. Irving Brown.

Wednesday, June 14

1:00 p.m. Opening Session

Presiding Conference Chairman—Jack Morrison, Dean, College of Fine Arts, Ohio University

Co-Chairman—Augustin Siré, Director, Instituto del Teatro, University of Chile

Greetings from the Community

Dr. Gustave O. Arlt, President

Council of Graduate Schools of the United States

Miss Kathryn Bloom, Director

Arts and Humanities Program, U. S. Office of Education

Mrs. Zelda Fichandler, Producing-Director

Arena Stage

Dr. Charles Frankel, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs

Dr. Dorothy Madden, Vice-President

National Council for the Arts in Education

Charge to the Conference—Jack Morrison

Response—Augustin Siré

3:00 p.m. First Meeting of Discussion Groups

3:00 p.m.-5:30 p.m. Work Group Sessions. Analysis of the charge, of the problem, of the group's task. Outline of the attack on the problem. Beginning of detailed work.

Thursday, June 15

- 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m. Group Sessions. Detailed exploration of problems.
- 1:30-3:00 p.m. Work Group Sessions. Decisions on initial work and feasibility of assignment. Preparation of report for evening Plenary Session.
- 8:30 p.m.-10:30 p.m. Plenary Session. Presentation of Work Group reports and recommendations. Submission of plan of attack and scope of the problem to the whole group for discussion. Rearrangement of Work Groups (additions, deletions, and reassignments) as may be found necessary.

Friday, June 16

- 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m. Work Group Sessions.
- 1:30 p.m.-3:00 p.m. Work Group Sessions.
- 8:30 p.m.-10:30 p.m. Work Group Sessions.

Saturday, June 17

- 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m. Work Group Sessions. Conclusion of detail work and statement of findings.
- 1:30 p.m. Work Group Sessions. Preparation of tentative final reports for evening Plenary Session.
- 8:30 p.m.-10:30 p.m. Plenary Session. Presentation of tentative final reports. Charge for final reports.

Sunday, June 18

- 9:30 a.m.-11:30 a.m. Work Group Sessions. Preparation of final reports.
- 12:00 noon-1:30 p.m. Plenary Session. Final reports. Summing up.

Discussion Groups

I. Training Theatre Personnel, Development and Operation

Lewin Goff, Kansas University, *Chairman*
Ralph Allen, University of Pittsburgh, *Editor*

René Hainaux
Eui Kyung Kim
A. Siré
M. Tsarev
M. Veselinovic

Jean Erdman
Monroe Lippman
Arthur Lithgow
Charles Nolte
Duncan Ross

II. *Theatre and its Developing Audience*

Bernard Beckerman, Columbia University, *Chairman*

Francis Hodge, University of Texas, *Editor*

E. Guibuorg
E. Dufour
F. Hont
M. Lukes
Humberto Orsini
Irving Brown

Arthur Cole
Aaron Frankel
Milton Lyon
Sombhu Mitra
Peter Zeisler
Mary H. Wolf

III. *Developing and Improving Artistic Leadership*

Earle Gister, Carnegie Institute of Technology, *Chairman*

Brooks McNamara, University of Delaware, *Editor*

Joel Adedeji
E. Alkazi
Reynaldo D'Amore
Jean Darcante
H. Ullberg

Arvi Kivimaa
Lee Beltzer
Randolph Edmonds
E. Schumacher
Robert Loper

IV. *Theatre in the Education Process*

Horace Robinson, University of Oregon, *Chairman*

O. G. Brockett, Indiana University, *Editor*

Radu Beligan
Cecile Guidote
Dr. Okot p'Bitek
Hans Michael Richter
H. D. Sugathapala
Ryoichi Nakagawa
In Hyung Yoo

William Cleveland
Vera Roberts
Geraldine Siks
Henry B. Williams
Mehdi Forough

V. *Improving Design for the Theatrical Function: Scenography, Structure, and Function*

Theodore Hoffman, New York University, *Chairman*

Richard Schechner, Tulane University, *Editor*

K. Koizumi
Sombhu Mitra
K. Spaic
G. Tovstonogov
Wim Vesseur

Paul Baker
Gary Gaiser
Dorothy Madden
Howard Malpas
Arthur Risser

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CONFERENCE

- Argentina*—E. GUIBUORG, Buenos Aires
Belgium—RENÉ HAINAUX, Le Théâtre dans le Monde, 12, avenue du Marechal, Bruxelles 18
Ceylon—H. D. SUGATHAPALA, 11 Thurston Road, Colombo 3
Chile—EMILE DUFOUR, Chilean Centre, ITI, Londres 81, 2 Piso, Santiago
 AUGUSTIN SIRÉ, Sec. Gen. ILAT, University of Chile, Santiago
Czechoslovakia—MILAN LUKES, Napetrinach 1896/31, Prague 6
East Germany—HANS MICHAEL RICHTER, Stadtische Theatre Leipzig, 701 Leipzig, Karl-Marx-Platz, Leipzig
Finland—ARVI KIVIMAA, President, Finnish Centre, ITI, Vuorikatu 6A, Helsinki
France—JEAN DARCANTE, Secretary General ITI, 6 rue Franklin, Paris 16
Hungary—FERENC HONT, President, Hungarian Centre, ITI, Institute des Sciences du Théâtre, Krisztina krt, 57, Budapest 1
India—E. ALKAZI, Director, National School of the Theatre, Rabindra Bhavan, Ferodeshah Road, New Delhi
 SOMBHU MITRA, 11a Nasiruddin Road, Calcutta 17
Iran—MEHDI FOROUGH, Faculty of Dramatic Arts, Teheran University, Teheran
Japan—K. KOIZUMI, Takanawa, Apt. 27, Nishidai-Machi, Minato-Ku, Tokyo
 RYOICHI NAKAGAWA, Professor of Dramatic Arts, Ohtsuma Woman's University, Tokyo
Korea—EUI KYUNG KIM, Secretary-General ITI Korea, 8, Ye-jang-dong, Joong-ku, Seoul
 IN HYUNG YOO, Korea Drama Center, Seoul
Netherlands—WIM VESSEUR, Netherlands Centre ITI, Nieuwe Uitleg 15, The Hague
Nigeria—JOEL ADEDIJI, University of Ibadan, Ibadan
Peru—REYNALDO D'AMORE, Secretary General, Peruvian Centre ITI, Colmena 757 (Subsuelo), Lima
The Philippines—CECILE GUIDOTE, Central Institute of Theatre Art, Manila
Poland—BOHDAN KORZENIEWSKI, ITI, Warsaw
Romania—RADU BELIGAN, President, Rumanian Centre ITI, 16 rue Filimon-Sirbu, Bucharest
Sweden—HANS ULLBERG, Riksteatern, Svenska-Teatern, Stockholm
U.S.S.R.—GYORGI TOVSTONOGOV, ITI, Leningrad
 MIKAIL TSAREV, ITI, Moscow
Uganda—DR. OKOT P'BITEK, Uganda National Theatre, Kampala
Venezuela—HUMBERTO ORSINI, President, Venezuelan Centre ITI, El Silencio, Bloque 5, Letra J, n3, Caracas
West Germany—ERICH SCHUMACHER, General Director, Municipal Theatres of Essen, Becksietenstrasse 4, 43 Essen
Yugoslavia—MLADJA VESELINOVIC, Secretary Yugoslav Centre ITI, Borisa Kidrica 25, Belgrade
 KOSTA SPAIC, Gunduliceva 63, Zagreb
- United States*
 RALPH ALLEN—University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 PAUL BAKER—Dallas Theatre Centre, Dallas, Texas
 BERNARD BECKERMAN—School of the Arts, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
 LEE BELTZER—AIDART, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 TRAVIS BOGARD—Department of Dramatic Art, University of California, Berkeley
 O. G. BROCKETT—Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana
 IRVING BROWN—Arts and Humanities Program, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
 WILLIAM CLEVELAND—The George School, George, Pa.
 ARTHUR COLE—Midland Community Theatre, Midland, Texas
 RANDOLPH EDMONDS—Florida A. & M., Tallahassee, Florida
 ELDEN ELDER—AIDART, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 AARON FRANKEL—Society of Stage Directors & Choreographers, New York, N. Y.
 GARY GAISER—Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana
 ROSAMOND GILDER—24 Gramercy Park, New York, N. Y. 10003

ERLE GISTER—Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 LEWIN GOFF—University of Kansas, Lawrence
 FRANCIS HODGE—University of Texas, Austin
 THEODORE HOFFMAN—School of the Arts, New York University, New York, N. Y.
 MONROE LIPPMAN—Tulane University, New Orleans, La.
 ARTHUR LITHGOW—McCarter Theatre, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
 ROBERT LOPER—University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
 MILTON LYON—Actors Equity Foundation, New York, N. Y.
 DOROTHY MADDEN—University of Maryland, College Park
 HOWARD MALPAS—Mills College, Oakland, Calif.
 RUTH MAYLEAS—National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D. C.
 BROOKS MCNAMARA—University of Delaware, Newark
 CHARLES NOLTE—Box 71, Wayzata, Minn.
 ARTHUR RISSER—University of Wichita, Wichita, Kansas
 VERA ROBERTS—Hunter College, New York, N. Y.
 HORACE ROBINSON—University of Oregon, Eugene
 DUNCAN ROSS—University of Washington, Seattle
 RICHARD SCHECHNER—School of the Arts, New York University, New York, N. Y.
 GERALDINE SIKS—University of Washington, Seattle
 HENRY B. WILLIAMS—Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
 MARY H. WOLF—The American Shakespeare Festival, Stratford, Conn.
 PETER ZEISLER—Minneapolis Theatre Company, Minneapolis, Minn.
 JACK MORRISON (*Conference Chairman*)—Ohio University, Athens
 For the American Educational Theatre Association:
 H. BERESFORD MENAGH, Executive Secretary-Treasurer
 ISABEL M. GRAYDON, Conference Coordinator

**GROUP I
Conference
Report**

RALPH ALLEN
Training Theatre Personnel

The Panel:

LEWIN GOFF, *U.S.A.*, *Chairman*

JEAN ERDMAN, *U.S.A.*
RENÉ HAINAUX, *Belgium*
EUI KYUNG KIM, *Korea*
MONROE LIPPMAN, *U.S.A.*
ARTHUR LITHGOW, *U.S.A.*

CHARLES NOLTE, *U.S.A.*
DUNCAN ROSS, *U.S.A.*
AGUSTIN SIRÉ, *Chile*
MIKAIL TSAREV, *U.S.S.R.*
MLADJA VESELINOVIC, *Yugoslavia*

THE PANEL ON TRAINING THEATRE PERSONNEL WAS COMPOSED LARGELY OF VISITING actors from other countries and North American theatre educators. Sharing the perhaps conservative assumption that the actor, rather than the playwright or designer is the primary creator in the performing theatre, the members devoted more than two-thirds of their time to discussing theoretical and practical problems in acting. The panel addressed itself also to the problem of training playwrights and briefly considered the director and the designer.

1. Stanislavski Re-examined

As might be expected of a group of actors working in traditionalist and eclectic theatres, the visitors to the United States unanimously cited the theories and practice of Stanislavski as the foundation on which their art was built. This nearly unanimous allegiance to the principles of psychological realism went unchallenged even by Mr. Kim of Korea, whose interest in western practices testified to the numerous ways in which nationalist theatre forms are being replaced by a series of more generally recognized conventions of performance.

No representative of the Berliner Ensemble was present, but the European delegates suggested that the principles of Stanislavski are useful even when an actor prepares a Brechtian role. Mr. Tsarev reported that Brecht's plays are currently very popular in Moscow and that Russian actors find their traditional training very helpful in the preparation of an Epic performance. To Mr. Tsarev, the system of Stanislavski represents no more nor less than the "truth of experience," and while he was most eloquent of all the panelists in his endorsement of the techniques of his countryman, he was ably seconded by Mr. Veselinovic, Mr. Siré, and Mr. Hainaux.

Only the Anglo-American, Mr. Ross, offered a challenge to the Stanislavski approach, but that challenge amounted to a complete denial of the premises of the Russian system.

Briefly summarized, Mr. Ross's position is as follows: Stanislavski's conception of acting is based on a false, or at least on an outmoded conception of human behavior inherited from the 17th Century, most particularly from Descartes. In the older view, man is seen as essentially dualistic; he is composed of active and inert elements. This "dualistic philosophy" frequently leads to the separation of form and substance in actor training. Moreover, it fosters a conception of style as an ornament which can be taught separately from other acting problems as a final step in the actor's development. For this "mechanistic" view of man, Mr. Ross would substitute a model of behavior which sees man as "organic," which recognizes that the brain is a part of the body, and makes no distinction between mental and physical activity. While acknowledging that Michael Chekhov's modification of Stanislavski's theories anticipates some aspect of his approach, Mr. Ross cited Whitehead, and most particularly Rudolf Laban, as more important influences on the development of his ideas. Laban's analysis of the relationship of movement to space, time and weight is recommended as particularly helpful in developing the "organic" approach to actor-training.

Mr. Ross criticized the disintegrative tendencies of the Stanislavski approach which isolates aspects of the actor's operations. He cited the chapter in *An Actor Prepares* on relaxation of muscles. There, Stanislavski noted that concentrating attention on the relaxation of muscles left the student in a more uncoordinated state than before, but that Stanislavski offered no solution to the dilemma. Mr. Ross also referred to the frequent tendency of American students to equate "Relaxation" with "Collapse." Another result, he maintained, of the self-consciousness inherent in the Stanislavski training is the slowness of rhythmic changes which the student feels necessary in making transitions between actions. Mr. Ross believes that there are rhythmic factors in the text which speak directly to the actor. These factors are ignored by Stanislavski, who also fails to allow for the importance of creating the "temperament of the role." Only Stanislavski's concept of the objective survives Mr. Ross's attack, and only then as redefined in terms of the actor's invention and not as a feature of textual analysis.

Details of Mr. Ross's theory (which he associates also with the practice of Kristin Linklater) were hotly debated by the other panelists.

Mr. Hainaux supported Mr. Ross's observations about the slowness of rhythmic transitions in the work of American student actors. He sees the sluggish rate of standard American speech as a factor in the dullness of their performance. He blames this dullness, however, on a misinterpretation by North Americans of Stanislavski and in no sense rejects the Russian director's basic principles.

Mr. Siré, in defending Stanislavski, began by questioning some of the details of Mr. Ross's argument. He claims, for example, that some people misunderstand what Stanislavski meant by relaxation. Mr. Siré argued that the elements of relaxation and tension cannot be separated. Indeed, relaxation, when properly understood, presupposes a degree of tension appropriate to the dramatic situation.

Mr. Tsarev and Mr. Veselinovic both emphasized that Stanislavski's teaching does not in fact constitute a dogmatic system at all but sets forth a pragmatic method. The use of this method varies with its practitioners and must be adapted to the ethos of the various nations in which it is employed.

Mr. Tsarev insisted that Stanislavski's "system" is creative and flexible rather than dogmatic. Its aim is to promote freedom in the performer. He attacked what he considered to be Mr. Ross's definition of "tension" and "relaxation," suggesting that he may have confused the absolutely necessary tension of a role with the muscular and mechanical tension which is always detrimental to imaginative work. Movement must be light and free; Stanislavski's exercises in relaxation always serve as a precondition of freedom.

The theoretical debate served as the basis for most of the practical discussions that followed and helped to define the issues when the panel began discussing the concept of integrated actor training. (See Section 4 below.)

2. *Talent Defined: Its Identification and Evaluation*

Regardless of their differences concerning acting theory, the panelists were agreed that there is a common core of abilities needed by an actor whether he intends to work for an eclectic theatre or for one dedicated to a single cohesive pattern of performance (e.g. The Berliner Ensemble). Exceptions were made in the case of theatres in which "extremes of style" are demanded of the actor, whether those extremes are traditional (e.g. Oriental conventions imposed upon a Western performance) or experimental (e.g., Grotowski's new patterns of stage behavior). None of the panel felt qualified to talk about the Kabuki or Noh drama, nor did anyone indicate much interest in discussing the most recent avant-garde forms.

The core of abilities required for most performance situations is related to the actor's emotional freedom, his imagination, and his expressiveness, qualities which are difficult to identify and measure. It was agreed that it would be useful to exchange information about possible ways of assessing a neophyte's ability.

The procedures for accomplishing these ends in countries other than the United States show a remarkable similarity of approach. All the professional training schools represented by our guests demand some form of examination (in most cases a written one) and some form of oral presentation (usually a series of prepared speeches and/or a scene). In each school the students were not eligible for admission until they had completed the equivalent of an American high-school education.

Perhaps Mr. Siré's description of the Chilean auditions may be taken as typical of the rest. From approximately 120 candidates only 25 are chosen. Most of the 120 are interviewed by the director who eliminates some of them. The remaining candidates fill out written questionnaires in which they are asked to describe their attitude toward the theatre, their experience, and their reactions to various types of dramatic literature. They then participate in at least three short scenes before an audience of approximately twelve professors in the school. The first scene has been rehearsed three or four times with the assistance of a teacher; the second, prepared without assistance, is a passage of the candidate's own choosing; the third is an improvisation (largely in pan-

tomime) starting from a situation constructed by one of the professors. Other exercises—including eight readings to test vocal quality—may be added as needed.

Procedures in other countries differ in detail but not in objective or essential technique from that described by Mr. Siré. In Yugoslavia for example (where three schools exist, one in each of the three native languages) the students have six months to prepare for their oral examination, which consists of the presentation of a classical poem, an excerpt from a play, a short pantomime and an improvisation offered by a professor. All these exercises are performed before an audience of faculty members. In addition there are written examinations to determine the general educational background of the candidates. The Russian schools are similar in essentials to those of Yugoslavia, their methods differing only in details. In Belgium, the chief variation would appear to be the requirement of an aptitude test, designed to gather information about the qualities of the candidate's perception.

Another approach to the assessment of talent which differed strikingly from the rest was a method initiated by Mr. Ross this year for his new program at the University of Washington. This method (based on his "organic" approach to acting) created considerable interest among a number of panelists. Mr. Ross's goal is to discover an "emotionally balanced student, who has the freedom to allow physical behavior to occur spontaneously, and who can change physical and emotional states under the influence of a variety of rhythmical stimuli." Despite philosophical differences with Mr. Ross, most of the other panelists agreed that the qualities he mentions are in sum a reasonable approximation of their understanding of the word "talent."

3. *The Structure of Actor Training Courses*

The traditional system for training actors in European and American conservatories separates, at least in the first year, the specialized training of the actor's "instrument" (courses in speech, dance, stage movement, gymnastics, etc.) from the primary work of interpretation (the development of his sensitivity to himself and to a text).

The panel's investigation of the structure of training programs debated the value of this traditional system. Discussion centered on the recently fashionable suggestion that curricular separations of technique and sensibility are artificial, and that swift progress in the acquiring of acting skills demands an integration of technical and interpretative training.

The foreign visitors all supported the notion of integrated training, although perhaps not so radically as Mr. Ross, who objected even to the terms which define the problem. He suggested that the very use of words like "instrument" implicitly presupposes the outmoded nonorganic view of human nature which he sees as the principal error of Stanislavski's system.

Mr. Ross contended that style is substance, that speech and movement are acting. He argued that artificial distinctions create inhibitions in young actors and make them self-conscious and mannered. Instead he urged that exercises in stage movement be related to a behavioral objective and that, for example, the young actor should begin to make noises in his very first movement

classes. Expressiveness of voice, Mr. Ross felt, is related to expressiveness of body. Therefore body movement is a more useful stimulus of emotion than mental imagery. It is more profitable to ask a student to express the movement-feeling of a line of Shakespeare, Mr. Ross suggested, than to involve him in a search for sub-text.

In this particular matter the practice of the foreign visitors differed only in degree from that of Mr. Ross.

The professional schools represented by guests from abroad all offer courses in voice, movement, and related subjects during the first year, but then proceed quickly to more integrated training. In Yugoslavia separate teachers of voice, movement, acrobatics, fencing and other skills work independently with the student during the first year. However, the fencing soon ceases to be physical activity for its own sake and becomes, for example, the fencing of Edgar and Edmund in *King Lear*. In the second year an integration of training occurs under the direction of the students' principal teacher, and by the third year, a perfect fusion of style and form is looked for in each student's performance. Mr. Siré supported the Yugoslavian position. He advocates integrated training early in the student's career. Teachers of acrobatics, fencing, and speech coordinate their work with the major acting teacher during the first year, and most subsequent work is entirely integrated. Mr. Siré agreed with Mr. Ross that, in non-integrated situations, students who may show flexibility and talent in a movement class sometimes have an inability to transfer their knowledge from one compartment to another and are frozen when faced in acting class with a so-called "interpretive" problem.

The Russian practice tends to delay integration longer than the rest. No text at all is introduced into the first of the four years of training at the Moscow schools. At the end of the second year students work with a text for the first time. In the third year they give modest performances for school audiences and in the fourth year they perform in a total production. In three-year programs (Western Europe, Chile) school performances are customarily delayed until the second year and public performances until the third. Some three-year programs (e.g. Chile) allow the students to participate in professional production under the watchful eye of their teachers as early as the second year. In Chile a post-graduate year of professional apprenticeship is added to the basic course.

4. *The Importance of Cultural Training for the Actor*

The panel unanimously agreed that despite the contemporary enthusiasm for the undisciplined maverick genius there is no necessity for an actor to be illiterate. Indeed there is every reason to hope that he will be a cultured man, if only because his profession touches and draws nourishment from so many other kinds of knowledge.

None of the theatre schools represented on the panel admitted at first to neglecting the *general* education of the actor. The Maly school in Moscow, for example, teaches history, literature and related subjects to the students, as does Mr. Siré's school in Chile and Mr. Veselinovic's in Belgrade.

Mr. Hainaux, himself a professor of dramatic literature, finally persuaded the panel to admit that many schools are hypocritical and pay only lip-service

to the notion of liberal education. Not only do schools frequently allow rehearsals to preempt time originally scheduled for classes, but student-actors, whose restlessness seems to be the only dependable factor in a highly unpredictable profession, are bored by systematic pedagogical approaches to knowledge.

Mr. Hainaux stressed the need of discovering new ways of teaching cultural subjects—methods closely related to the actor's immediate performance problems. (Interpretation of literature, for example, might be taught as part of a problems in diction courses.) Mr. Nolte seemed offended by Mr. Hainaux's apparent suggestion that actors have to be tricked like children into knowledge. Mr. Hainaux with some heat replied that he intended no such implication. He had simply meant to say that the actor has a special way of looking at the world, a perspective capable of rich insights, different from, but every bit as valuable as the insight of scholars and scientists. The latter tends perhaps to enjoy abstract thought, while the former sees the world imagistically but nevertheless with great penetration.

Various proposals were made, notably by Mr. Ross and Mr. Hainaux, for integrating the study of psychology, literature, and historical background with acting problems. Mr. Ross, not finding all the kinds of experience that his student actors need in certain courses of his university, reported that he was planning to inaugurate this year a series of case studies in textual analysis and historical research all of them related to specific acting tasks. These case-studies, four in number, are only incidentally designed to communicate vast amounts of knowledge. They are instead examples of techniques that the actor must continue to employ as he explores his subsequent roles. Mr. Ross is optimistic that in this way, his students will develop a hunger for knowledge and gave examples of earlier hungers which he had induced at the National Theatre School of Canada.

Mr. Lippman described the American system of concentrating liberal studies in the undergraduate years and admitting candidates to professional training only after they had completed their baccalaureate. Mr. Ross objected to the rigid structure of American higher education. He said this system did not sufficiently trust the individual to work independently and urged the view that one subject in which the student is really interested studied in depth and intensity would, through its many and necessary relations with other fields of human inquiry, promote an expansion of interest and search for knowledge.

The question of the appropriateness of professional training in American universities recalled an earlier remark of Mr. Hainaux. He had observed an odd contradiction in American culture: the creation of new programs by college administrators risks training artists for theatres which sometimes do not exist. Mr. Hainaux added that the academic community might well take more responsibility for establishing and supporting professional work. The North Americans on the panel warmly endorsed Mr. Hainaux's suggestion. Perhaps the apparently inimical world of the university offers the only American opportunity for a free and truly national professional theatre.

Postscript

Plea for a Methodology

by RENÉ HAINAUX

When I began visiting the principal theatre schools and participating in international conferences on theatre training—that was nearly twenty years ago!—I was immediately struck by the modesty shown by the great teachers.

No one pretended to know a secret; each was at pains to say “I teach the game, but I know that there is no method for creating actors . . . I teach voice, but I am the enemy of all systems; I have no system. . . .”

From the Old Vic School to the School of Strasbourg, from Vienna to Stockholm, from Rome to Moscow—without forgetting Bristol, Zagreb, Helsinki, Munich—the same anthem resounded.

In the spring of 1967, I was privileged to be invited to universities in Kansas, Minneapolis, Denver and New York. I was investigating courses in playwriting. Everywhere I met intelligent and enthusiastic professors who confided to me with a smile, “Yes, I am in charge of a course in playwriting. Naturally, as you know, there is no way to teach people to write . . .”

This has been going on for twenty years, and I have had enough of it!

Certainly humility is a virtue, but applied to conversation among experts, it blocks all progress.

Of course, the teacher should avoid being dogmatic. Lack of confidence is understandable. He watches with reserve and even with bewilderment, the anarchic and voluntarily disordered proceedings of the creative artist. At the same time the artist considers with suspicion the efforts of the teacher to make the mysterious ways of creation clear, legible and ordered. This old quarrel bores me!

I well know that when I prepared *Richard III* with Michael Langham, *Oppenheimer* with Piscator, or *Quentin* in *After the Fall*, in none of these instances did I find my interpretation by logical means, but rather by a series of chances, of dazzling revelations.

But were not these “chances” like the discoveries of modern physics? They seize the brain of the scholar at the least expected moment, in the most unusual place. *But they are not born from nothing: they won't arise if you merely sit and dream.*

The level and the limits of the role of the teacher of dramatic art should be precise: I want him to organize his plan of work and his laboratory as a physicist does.

You see where I wish to come.

I wish that in the future, when we write a book, receive a foreign visitor, attend an international meeting, we would have the courage to say *what we are doing and how we are proceeding.*

Let us be serious. A course in playwriting—I swear it—does not consist only in repeating “One does not learn to write . . .” (although, to be sure, it might

be necessary to say it from time to time to students). I admire Bernard Grebanier who, in his book, *Playwriting*, has the courage to end each chapter with a series of exercises. Grebanier knows well that these exercises are only propositions and, indeed, I only use them with modifications for my students. But at least Grebanier communicates his experience to me and I thank him for it.

I hold an affectionate respect for Michel Saint-Denis, but I wonder if his *finesse*, his respect for the individual, his dislike for all codification—in sum his thoroughly French temperament—does not end by applying the brakes to research. I remember his attitude at the Symposium at Brussels, when the Soviet delegates presented us—with what mastery!—some examples of their 263 ways of falling out of a chair. And also at the Symposium at Stockholm, when the Berliner Ensemble demonstrated in the most infinite detail the mechanism of alienation. Michel Saint-Denis admired it and disliked it at one and the same time.

I will make him angry—and I'm sorry—but I, now, demand examples not general principles, precision not prefaces, systems not defenses.

Will you have the patience to permit me one example?

At Stockholm in April, 1967, we began to discuss the means of endowing future actors with some cultural knowledge.

Most schools furnished an impressionistic list of courses dealing with this objective: history of dramatic literature, history of theatre, civilization of daily life, and even Marxist-Leninist aesthetics!

However, no school by itself recognized what we have all experienced: that the student-actor only attends such courses by force under constraint.

Why? Because by so much as the student actor responds to the solicitation of the imagination, he reacts badly to the acquisition of abstraction.

What to conclude? That we ought to define precisely a pedagogical curriculum (call it a system and send me to the devil!) which is capable of circumventing the student actor so that he acquires voluntarily the indispensable intellectual equipment.

Every school meets this problem. Every great school finds its own solutions.

We will raise the level of teaching dramatic art in the world by so much as these great schools agree to tell their secrets.

Doubtless, teachers of genius will remain as isolated cases, fascinating and partly uncommunicative—or perhaps, momentarily uncommunicative. I recall Kristin Linklater in a corridor in Brussels, refusing to explain, because everything new is hard to explain. I understand Jerzy Grotowski when he says to me over coffee, "What you saw is not what I did. . . ."

But give us, please, for the schools which are not great and the teachers who are not geniuses, at least a minimum of rules and exercises which will permit them to achieve a new start.

Translated from the original French

Postscript*The Education of Technicians in the U.S.S.R.*by MIKAIL TSAREV

Problems concerning the education of technicians for the theatre are essential in the life of the theatre of each country. In the U.S.S.R. this problem is solved in the following way. There have already been in existence for several years departments which prepare specialists in stage techniques. These departments were established in Moscow at the Nemirovich-Danchenko Moscow Art Theater Studio-School and in Leningrad at the Ostrovskiy State Institute of Stage Arts. These departments are under the direction of Professor V. V. Shverubovich in Moscow and of Peoples' Actor of the U.S.S.R., Nikolai Akimov, in Leningrad.

Young people who have completed the full ten-year secondary education are accepted into these departments. Admission is made in accordance with the entrance requirements of other higher technical institutions. More attention is given to the disciplines of mathematics and physics. In the course of study students acquire knowledge of all the sciences bearing on the techniques of the theatre in order to have an exact knowledge of stage settings, scenery construction, lighting problems, costumes, props, and accessories, as well as make-up. In a workshop theatre these specialists master skills which prepare them for all that relates to the production of a play. Upon graduation they receive certificates bearing the title—General Technical Engineer of Theatrical Affairs.

In Moscow there is also a college for the preparation of specialists in the separate branches of the production of plays: specialization in the preparation of props, accessories and wigs, and experts in the art of make-up, cosmetologists. Into this college are accepted individuals with a seventh year secondary education.

The All Russia Theatrical Society which unites more than 24,000 theatre workers and is a public organization has an office of staging, a section of which periodically conducts seminars to augment the qualifications of stage technicians.

Under contemporary requirements for a scientific approach to directing, techniques of scene decoration, production, lighting and all the other components which create a successful presentation, the measures described above have contributed to the solution of this vital and important problem, although they have not solved it completely.

Translated from the original Russian

Postscript*Towards an Organic Approach to Actor Training:
A Criticism of the Stanislavski Scheme*by DUNCAN ROSS

The most important topic for actor training, by the general consensus of the panel at this conference, seemed to be the problem of "integration:" how should the bodily skills be combined with work on imagination, textual analysis, etc., etc. A more comprehensive question was only touched, the problem of style: the direct and all-pervasive influence of the individual author's form on the actor's creation of a role. But what never reached discussion was the consideration of how to teach acting which has the quality of spontaneity, no matter how formalized the structure of the dramatic text. In the opinion of the writer, this is the prime topic from which the others depend.

By "spontaneous" we may understand what Macready admired in the acting of Talma, which even in "lofty declamation . . . gave an air of unpremeditation to every sentence."¹ (Here we may note in passing that Talma's achievement is an indication that spontaneity is in no way restricted to the conventions of "naturalism.") The subjective experience of such acting is as Sir Arthur Sherrington,² one of the fathers of modern neuro-physiology, described, a completely integrated act: as when we catch a cup that we have knocked off the table before we know we are going to catch it. Such an act is not instinctive, "catching" *has to be learned*. And to foreshadow the burden of this argument, it should be pointed out that it is possible for such an act to occur in positions not previously practiced, the body may never have been in that precise configuration before. In short, skill is not attached to, or learned through, specific movements but is the development of an area of related activity. Lastly, in such an act there is no subjective experience of watching oneself, nor does the experience present itself in consciousness as blurred or rushed; on the contrary, there is a sense of ease.

It is the contention here that the problems outlined in the first paragraph derive from the structure of those programs that divide training into specialized areas, and not from the essential nature of the subject. It is further maintained that such divisive and disintegrative methods are the consequence of a more fundamental error: the employment of an inappropriate model of our nature. As a consequence of the facts of the case, such training imparts a permanent effect of self-attention which may only be eradicated by a complete reorganization of approach. (This is achieved on occasions by the individual actor under the pressure of the actual circumstances of the theatre, usually under the criticism of an exceptionally sensitive director.) But there is now sufficient knowledge available to relieve actors of such difficulties. Lastly, it is a frequent observation that outstandingly talented actors seem to operate in a different way from

¹ A. H. Nagler, *A Source Book in Theatrical History* (New York, 1952), p. 469.

² Sir Arthur Sherrington, *Man on His Nature* (Penguin, England, 1955), p. 159.

the general body of performers. It is the writer's belief that teaching theory must account coherently for this achievement. An attitude of mystic reverence for "talent" is no answer. *Either we must teach how these actors do, or we are not teaching the subject.*

At the conference it was notable that the concern for devising an integrated solution went hand in hand with a general approval for the basic theories of Stanislavski. It will be argued here that the unscrutinized assumptions underlying those theories derive from the same inappropriate model of our nature. They must, therefore, be rejected, together with the techniques of "the system;" particularly, since it is clear that these have never dealt adequately with the interrelated questions of developing a characterization and the function of style as an aspect of the role.

A. N. Whitehead advised philosophical criticism not to direct "chief attention to those intellectual positions which exponents feel it necessary explicitly to defend." He continued, "There will be some fundamental assumptions which adherents of all the variant systems within the epoch unconsciously presuppose. Such assumptions appear so obvious that people do not know what they are assuming because no other way of putting things has ever occurred to them. With these assumptions a certain limited number of types of philosophic systems are possible."³ What applies to the philosophic systems of an epoch holds equally for its acting systems. The unscrutinized underlying assumptions permit only a limited number of types of model, of the world and of our natures as of that world. All such models operative in extant acting theories are of the type which Gilbert Ryle has abusively, but graphically, termed the idea of "Mind" as "a ghost in a machine."⁴

The term "model" is used here in the manner which J. S. Bruner suggests, "Knowledge is a model we construct to give meaning and structure to regularities in experience."⁵ The evolution of the atom, say, from Thomson to Schrödinger, is an example. Bruner points out that such models are "inventions." He illustrates with the notion of "pressure." He writes, "We weigh things or study the manner in which our instruments move under set conditions. 'Pressure' is the construct we invent to represent the operations we perform and the regularities in experience that occur when we perform them. Does pressure exist? Well, yes, provided you have invented it."⁶

The model of our nature unthinkingly operative in every-day discourse is that of "a ghost in a machine." It derives from a concatenation of influences: the use of verbal operations for thinking, in the structure of language itself; in sense perception, the appearance of the world as we directly apprehend it; in the mismanagement of logic, a confusion of categories; in the subjective experience of our bodies in action, the concentration of the external receptors—eyes, ears, taste and smell, etc.—and the sensitivity of the organs of voice and respiration in the upper body; and in the emotional predilection of certain antique philosophers, the longing for permanence in the objective world and in the ideas our experience may construct from it.

³ A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (New York, 1958), pp. 49-50.

⁴ Gilbert Ryle, *The Concept of Mind* (New York, 1962).

⁵ Jerome S. Bruner, *On Knowing, Essays for the Left Hand* (New York, 1966), p. 120.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 106.

A Subject-Predicate structure makes alternatives to the dualistic model difficult to be thought. The imaginary model presented in the formula, "I move my arm," provides a ghostly operator, of "mental stuff," working an instrument, the body, made of "material stuff." (It is instructive to note here the pains R. S. Woodworth⁷ takes in enjoining the beginner in psychology to treat all nouns as verbs or activities.) Sense perception, which is, of course, partly conditioned by the language activities of the organism, reinforces the dualistic construct. The seeming, continuous, undifferentiated endurance of physical bodies tends to develop the notion of a "matter," or "stuff," *inert* in its essence. Logical analysis, wholly verbal, requires the invention of an antithetical principle of motion to account for the undoubted movement perceivable in the world. The conjunction of these two principles, matter and motion, treats them as if they were items of the same category, a hopeless confusion. The concentration of sense receptors in the upper body tends to a polarized model of the body. Finally, what Whitehead called "the evil side of Platonism," from which, he said, derived "the disastrous antithesis between thought and action,"⁸ an attitude which has bedevilled the growth of Western thought, resides, as Irwin Edman notes, in the rejection of a model of the world as a "flux." He states that Plato's logic found, "Heraclitus' 'flux' left the intelligence dizzy with its lack of grippable permanences."⁹ To impose a model on thought which denies the reflections of observation for the sake of emotional comfort is a sentimentality which has truly proved disastrous. It is a relapse into childishness. An alternative is to proceed, as we do in fact, provisionally; treating knowledge itself as an operation, an activity, a way of going about.

Thus, the dilemma of acting training has a dire ancestry embedded in some of the most antique and inaccessible attitudes of our civilization. It is no discredit to Stanislavski to say that he was ill-equipped to say what he meant.

While an inert substantiality governed the notions of physics, an alternative, unitary model of our nature seemed impossible. But with the suggestion that the undifferentiated endurance of physical bodies may be only apparent, a useful abstraction for everyday operations but not necessarily ultimate, the basic antithesis of motion and matter dissolved. In its place we are asked to imagine structure of activity analogous to those of sound and light.¹⁰ An essence active. What we are offered in such a scheme is a series of levels of complexity of forms of vibratory activity that deliver novel features that appear, as the organization of the vibrations becomes increasingly complex, analogous to a melody that is not to be discovered in the notes but is delivered by the relations between them. In such a scheme the body itself, at whatever "level" of examination, physical, chemical, physiological or psychological, is a "doing." "Mind" and "Body" are then seen as abstractions of an everyday usefulness but in no way ultimate or discrete. Thus, *the notion of psycho-physical interaction is untenable*. It makes no more sense to talk of such interaction than to speak of molecular-atomic interaction; where there is the former there is the latter. A "mental image" is not the antecedent of a bodily occurrence; it is a sign that such an event is happening. Thus, the ideas of "internal" and "external" are misconstruc-

⁷ R. S. Woodworth, *Psychology* (London, 1961), p. 19.

⁸ A. N. Whitehead, *The Aims of Education* (New York, 1961), p. 58.

⁹ Irwin Edman, *The Works of Plato* (New York, 1928), xxxv.

¹⁰ See, for example, A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*, pp. 36-39.

tions. The movement of a limb and the bodily activity of which the image is a sign are both presentations of consciousness, both known to the organism only by the activity of the central nervous system.

Whitehead argued that the new physics allowed us to construct a continuity of principle throughout nature; that those features which had seemed to inhere only in biological forms were not appropriate to all entities of physics. Organic principles could apply throughout. A structure of activity, a "vibratory ebb and flow" analogous to sound and light, such as an atom was now imagined, exhibits autonomic homeostasis¹¹—i.e., spontaneous regulation of the relations between internal functions maintaining the form of the entity, within certain necessary conditions—in the manner of a biological organism.

Homeostasis of living organisms can be regarded either as the internal interrelation of functions as it was by Cannon, or it can be viewed as the pervasive influence of the form of an organic whole throughout the function of its members, in the manner of Gestalt psychology, or of such biologists as P. Weis, E. S. Russell, E. M. Sinnott and the neuro-psychologists K. Lashley and Kurt Goldstein. Such notions are, of course, entirely antithetical to "the ghost in the machine," the animistic-mechanistic model. That error proceeds by assembling discrete items achieved by analysis—scientific or verbal analysis and the superficial analysis of introspection—in the manner of a mosaic. It was the procedure of the older psychology until William James pointed out that the taste of lemonade was not the taste of sugar plus the taste of lemon, but an entirely new occurrence, the taste of lemonade.¹² The organic scheme does not repudiate analysis, but insists that the structure of the activity as a whole delivers features peculiar to its "holism."

Another aspect of the organic model requires the consideration of the *duration* of a function as an aspect of its form or nature. Whitehead was fond of saying, "It takes time to be iron . . . at least enough time to permit a particle to revolve once about a nucleus."¹³ With duration we are introduced to the *directiveness* of organic form. The spatio-temporal dimensiveness of all structures of activity is activity in a direction. The direction informed by an activity is a fundamental and inseparable aspect of its form or nature. A change of directiveness is a change in the entity. The perceptible directiveness of the behavior of living organisms, whether regarded internally as by Cannon or the visible outward behavior described by E. E. Russell¹⁴ (from the healing of wounds, or the growth of fur, to the selectiveness of eating by rats) or the directiveness of thinking examined by Humphrey,¹⁵ all can be regarded as alternative modes of adaptive activity attempting to maintain a relatively steady state of the organism as a whole. Stanislavski's concept of "objective" is a formulation of this goal-aimed directiveness of organic form. It is his great, and only, new contribution to acting theory.¹⁶

¹¹ The term "homeostasis" was applied by W. B. Cannon to the autonomic regulation of the physiological processes. See W. B. Cannon, *The Wisdom of the Body* (New York, 1963).

¹² See William James, *The Principles of Psychology* (New York, 1950), Vol. I, Chapters VI, VII and IX.

¹³ Reported by Sterling P. Lamprecht, *Our Philosophical Traditions* (New York, 1955), p. 478.

¹⁴ E. S. Russell, *The Directiveness of Organic Activities* (Cambridge, England, 1945).

¹⁵ G. Humphrey, *Directed Thinking* (New York, 1948).

¹⁶ All Stanislavski's other notions, e.g., the emotive factor of memory-images, etc., etc., have been known for centuries; see, for example, William Archer, *Masks or Faces* (New York, 1957).

With the model of an organism as a structure of activity, an image, an action, or an objective are seen to be different modifications of the structure, *all bodily events*. And, since a modification of the form of an activity necessitates an effect throughout the whole structure, the all-pervasive function of "the objective" is readily understandable.

The most far-reaching application of the notion of the organism as a structure of activity which the writer has met is in the writings of Kurt Goldstein. For his celebrated work in neuro-psychology Goldstein finds it necessary to employ the idea of a quantity of available energy which, he stresses, "is not only of the brain or of the state of the nutrition of the brain but also of the entire body."¹⁷ This energy continuously redistributes itself (homeostatically) as the organism operates in the immediate situation, both internally and outwardly. Goldstein uses this model to describe the phenomenon of "Attention." He writes, "I remarked upon the antagonistic character of the energy distribution between sensory and thought performances, which manifests itself in the reduced vividness of our sensory experiences and in our inattentiveness to them during the thought process." (Obviously, Goldstein is talking of reflective thinking.) He continues, "A similar antagonism exists between motor and sensory phenomena, between verbal and non-verbal performances, and so on. In these, and similar cases, we can assume that one performance is weakened because the available energy is being used to maintain activity in that mechanism upon which the performance depends."¹⁸ Thus, "Attention," *the crucial problem in actor training*, can be seen as a *focus* of the configuration of the structure of activity *which is the organism*; a configuration continuously changing as the organism operates in the present situation attempting to maintain its essential unity. Thus, "Attention" may be seen as the focal emphasis in the directive configuration of activity, but *only an emphasis in a configuration*; the rest of the pattern shading away in intensity from this focus.

With such a model we may understand the difference between "Attention" and "Awareness." The former is the directive focus, and the latter is all the peripheral sensitivities, passing imperceptibly through a gradient of intensities. An illustration may be taken from the function of sight, the differences between central and peripheral vision. The development of the peripheral field of "Awareness" is essential to actor training, for it is in this area that all techniques must be developed. *The attention of the organism must never at any stage of training focus on the subjective cues of its behavior*, either of "mental" or muscular operations. "Attention," because it is a function of the goal-aimed directiveness of the organism, is never centered on any feature of the present situation. *It is always concerned with the possibility of achievement in the immediate future*. Attention cannot, therefore, be developed by asking the actor to concentrate on any feature of the immediate present. If, for instance, the actor is asked to concentrate on "eye contact," this only finds him wondering which eye he should look at. In short, he begins to "concentrate on concentrating."¹⁹ "Eye-contact" is concerned with attempting to achieve a *change* in the eyes of the acting partner; a sign of the emotional change in the partner

¹⁷ Kurt Goldstein, *The Organism* (Boston, 1963), p. 59.

¹⁸ Goldstein, pp. 56-57.

¹⁹ I am indebted to Raphael Shelley, Movement Instructor, The Bristol Old Vic School, for this phrase.

which is the objective of the immediate action. Such emotive goals in the imaginative state of the partner, or of the audience in a soliloquy, are entirely the invention of the actor; they are in no way part of the text. They are what Stanislavski called the "subtext," but little reflection is needed to reveal that they are not "of the text" but are the creative invention of the actor.

The model of attention as a focus helps to account for the fundamental difference in the characteristics of a movement which is made with self-attention from one which is not. (The hollow, studied vocal tone which occurs when a speaker listens to his voice is an example.) Again, Goldstein has useful information. He sees a close relationship between the configuration of the energy of the organism and the operation of muscles. He states, "Whenever we intend a certain movement we do not innervate individual muscles or muscle groups, but a change in the present state of innervation of all the body muscles takes place. . . . For the appropriate contraction of one muscle group, i.e., for that contraction by which a definite effect results, a certain state of innervation of the remaining muscles is requisite." He continues, "A definite configuration of excitations in the entire organism, especially in the nervous system, corresponds to any single movement, *as well as to any performance of the organism.*"²⁰ (My emphasis) Thus, a movement which is attended to is not the same configuration as a movement made when the focus is on a goal through and beyond the movement. In other words, *those teachers who approach the "body" training of the actor by drawing attention to the sensation of muscles are not training the movements they are trying to develop.*

Such teachers frequently assert that the self-attention which is apparent in the behavior of their students will disappear as skill improves. This is contrary to the facts. Their arguments are based, usually, upon two related assumptions. One derives from an obsolete model of the function of the nervous system which held that behavior during early learning occupied "higher" centers of the nervous system and was then relegated to "lower" levels of reflex activity. We now know this model is false. The second is the result of superficial observation of child learning; speech may be taken as an example. This assumed that the child attended to individual units of speech movements and then as skill developed combined words into phrases, etc. This assumed that speech development followed the structure of language analysis. We now know that speech develops in an entirely opposite manner, from largely undifferentiated wholes of babbling progressively to increasingly particularized wholes, phrases of noise approximating to phrases of words. That is, it follows the manner of the biological development of an organism, from a simple uniform cell to increasingly specialized structures which are the palpable signs of an increased specialization of function; or as the growth of the mind was once described, like the form of a mountain range appearing through a mist, always an overall form, vague and imprecise, which becomes more specific, as a whole, as its particulars become clearer. The clarification of a detail spontaneously restructures the perception of the whole. The actor's creation of a role proceeds in an analogous manner. The notion of a "spine" or "core," is not a point of departure. It is an abstraction, only possible after a great deal of invention has gone on.

²⁰ Goldstein, pp. 229-230.

Self-attentiveness is observable in the actor trained in the Stanislavski techniques. Since an image and a muscle sensation are both presentations of consciousness, signs of bodily activity going on, the Stanislavski actor watching his image processes, or "Affective Memory," or what not, is operating a configuration of behavior as disintegrative as the "technique first" trainee. As Sherrington remarked, "If the mind is pursuing a clue in a crossword puzzle, it is not assisted by trying to divert part of itself into an observer of that pursuit. . . . It is an attempt at disintegration of the self."²¹ The organism functions through imagery, a bodily process, as it does by movements, another bodily activity, as a means to a goal beyond the immediate presentations of consciousness. All such cues of consciousness are functions of the peripheral awareness. The focus of activity is always on what *may* happen to assist the achievement of the goal.

The neglect of the function of peripheral awareness is one of the most serious errors of Stanislavski theory.²² The naive notion that we can apprehend only that to which we are attending overlooks the fact that occurrences outside the focus of attention can change the focus, "catch" our attention, if sufficiently important to the organism. In place of a simple "Circle of Attention" we must instate the notion of a *field* of consciousness, with the possibility of a continuous shift of focal emphasis throughout the field dependent upon the structure of the given circumstances. Such a model is essential for any dramatic text which by its formal features requires shifts, often extremely subtle, of the balance between attention to the objective and awareness of the audience. ("Restoration Comedy" is an obvious example, but Shakespeare demands a much wider, subtler and fluid variety of configuration of the actor's imaginative consciousness.)

More serious is the problem of audibility. When Goldstein's idea of the close relation between the energy distribution of the organism and the muscular configurations are kept in mind, it is not difficult to see that the Stanislavskian notion of "Circles of Concentration" spontaneously delivers an energy structure and muscular effort which makes inaudibility almost inevitable. The organism delivers an energy appropriate to the pattern of its psychological construct, which is the conscious sign of its configuration. Only when the facts of the situation are put clearly to the actor, when his evident awareness of the audience is presented to him as a source of an energy build-up, as a stimulus to, not a betrayal of "artistic truth," can the question of style be comprehensively approached. Stanislavski's "private moment," does not solve the problem of stage ease, it avoids it. If he had been capable of *fully* describing for himself what was going on when Salvini²³ went on stage before a performance, building make-up, characterization, and an awareness of the spatial volumes of the theatre, both auditorium and stage, as an imaginative organic unity, many conscientious students might have been saved the distress of trying to deny the nature of their consciousness. And if the function of the awareness of the volume of the theatre as a factor in the field of the actor's consciousness was more readily appreciated, particularly in its relation to the gradual and spontaneous development of

²¹ Sherrington, p. 249.

²² Stanislavski's story of the Maharajah's technique for choosing a minister is an extreme example of the fallacy. See *An Actor Prepares* (New York, 1961), p. 81.

²³ C. Stanislavski, *My Life in Art* (New York, 1963), pp. 273-274.

vocal energy, acting classes would not take place in rooms of inadequate size and structure. Probably, there are no small actors, only small studios.

The organic model, which sees the organism as a structure of activity organizing its unitary totality in a continuous flow of configurations of its energy, maintaining in an ever-changing immediate situation the soul of its nature manifested in the cyclic duration of its life process, exhibits an entity for which the only comprehensive description is *Rhythm*, much as I. A. Richards has attempted to describe the term. In such an entity every occurrence, percept, image, movement or any other function is a modification of the rhythmic whole, the "vibratory ebb and flow." In such a model, reading words on a page is a bodily activity which as it progresses becomes in Richards' words, "a vast cyclic agitation spreading all over the body."²⁴

The experiments of E. Jacobsen,²⁵ which revealed the spontaneous muscular activity that frequently manifests itself when imagery is operative, helps us to appreciate Richards' arguments. It is the writer's opinion that such muscular responsiveness is highly developed in the actor. By such means the "cyclic agitation" in the actor amplifies easily, without embarrassment, into large, visible and audible movements. Jacobsen's work provides one approach for instituting the spontaneous physical changes of "characterization."

Such activity sets up changes in the rhythmic structure of the organism. These rhythmic developments deliver emotional tone to the subjective experience of the actor. Much of the early activity of reading is presented in consciousness as imagery, and much of the muscular, kinaesthetic, aspects of imagery are so all-pervasive that they tend to be overlooked. (Bruner stated recently that current investigations into imagery were revealing that all imagery is essentially "of action,"²⁶ and D. O. Hebb²⁷ has argued with minute thoroughness for the constructive function of muscular movements in perception.) When this is understood, the error of the Stanislavskian notion of an "inner, mental" occurrence antecedent to a "reproduction"²⁸ in the "physical apparatus" is understandable. Similarly, the emotive effect of such activity appears to superficial introspection to be a feature of "inner, mental" life. The facts are, as William James insisted, entirely otherwise. (Those who criticized James for this theory were, as Hebb remarked, not really noticing what James was saying.) Bodily changes are instituted by the activity of reading, and emotion is a sign of their organization into a directive configuration. Emotion is not, therefore, a source of expression, or an "inner" occurrence requiring expression, but a consequence of the development of a goal-oriented activity. (Paulhan²⁹ first articulated this theory.)

²⁴ I. A. Richards, *Principles of Literary Criticism* (London, 1961), p. 140.

²⁵ E. Jacobsen, *Progressive Relaxation* (Chicago, 1929).

²⁶ *The Walker-Ames Lectures*, University of Washington, 1967.

²⁷ D. O. Hebb, *The Organization of Behaviour* (New York, 1961).

²⁸ The crucial passage clearly revealing Stanislavski's dualistic model is in *An Actor Prepares*, p. 15. The body is regarded as an "apparatus," in which the inner-mental is "reproduced." Also the fallacy of a naturalistic imaginary model as a beginning technique is adumbrated here. Those apologists who would claim that Stanislavski changed his ideas for a technique of "physical action" can be refuted. See Nina Gourfinkel, "The Actor Sets to Work on His Part," *World Theatre*, VIII (Number 1), 10-22. These extracts from Volume IV of Stanislavski's works, the most recent, still find him talking about "the interaction of the physical and the psychic."

²⁹ F. Paulhan, *The Laws of Feeling*, Trans. by C. K. Ogden (London, 1930).

Such imaginary goals are the invention of the actor. They do not require to be formulated in verbal terms. The actor may construct an image, preferably in the kinaesthetic mode, of how he wants the partner to respond and this ideated sketch forms the goal and focus of attention. *The technique is the core of all acting training. It should be used in all classes. It provides the central concept which, with the use of the notion of "awareness" achieves an organic unity in training, dissolving the problem of integration of "mental" and "physical" training.* Voice classes, for example, must always be speech attempting to achieve an emotional change in a listener.

Reading is, of course, a convention, a question of learned responses to arbitrary rules of symbolism. The view that dramatic texts which employ more rules are more artificial is naive. Formal devices of verse, prose, rhetoric, etc., are simply an extension of the rules of symbolism providing the author with more precise indications as to the responses which may be appropriate. When the rules are known, it is easier to be more precise as to what may be imagined in Richard III, for instance, than in, say, a play by O'Neill.

There is an aspect of reading of which Stanislavski theory is oblivious, what has been called the "tied" imagery of words. The term is used to distinguish between those aspects of word-meaning which derive from the sensations of speech, and those which have their source in the association of the referent, the item the word symbolizes. Sir Richard Paget³⁰ was a pioneer in this field: the kinaesthetic and vibratory sensations of the vocal organs associated with a particular word and the contribution they make to meaning. These effects are an important factor in Richards' "cyclic activity spreading all over the body." A student can be taught quite quickly to consider the meaning of words and phrases in terms of an all-pervasive kinaesthesia. By moving spontaneously in this kinaesthetic imaginary mode, complex subtleties of spontaneous vocal tones are produced together with a concomitant increase in acting energy and subjective emotional tone. The work of Rudolf Laban³¹ is a basic technique for extending the individual's kinaesthetic flexibility and so to an enrichment of meaning as rhythmic insight. Laban's vocabulary is a useful tool for discussing these aspects of the dramatic rhythm, the role.

From such an approach the student can be led to see that a dramatic text is essentially a series of *discrete* phrases which have to be organized into continuous, flowing, rhythmic wholes of the actor's neural-muscular configuration. By the technique of the objective, a goal of an emotive change in the acting partner, each bundle of related symbols, the phrase, is given a directive unity. Such objectives are developed on a trial and error basis in rehearsal. (Sir Laurence Olivier tells us that in one section of *Othello* he "intended angry insistence, but it developed into angry imploring. . . . I think I'll keep it.")³² The development of an objective transforms the bundle of symbols into an action of the actor, still, however, tentative and imprecise. The specific form of the action is organized by developing the kinaesthetic awareness of each word activity in the action, conditioned by the other symbolic devices, verse structure, rhetoric, etc. By this rhythmic progression the student sees that the phrase-actions, which lie in the text as

³⁰ Richard Paget, *Human Speech* (London, 1930).

³¹ Rudolf Laban, *Effort* (London, 1955).

³² Laurence Olivier, *Life Magazine*, May 1, 1964, 88.

discrete items, require the invention of *intertextual* activity. At an early stage this may take the form of verbalization, progressively reducing to visual, auditory and kinaesthetic imagery; finally this may reduce solely to a rhythmic interplay of muscles, particularly the musculatures of breathing. In the words of a brilliant, though largely ignored voice teacher, Bertie Scott, one "breathes in the mood." The student learns that the act of inspiration, inhalation, is an essential phase of each action, and that the formal demands of verse, and the like, are valuable signals for constructing the rhythmic whole which is the role.

To avoid misunderstanding it must be stressed that the "kinaesthesia" of a word is not a simple one-way affair, from the movement sensations of speech to a modification of meaning. The process is organic: all the factors involved at any particular moment are constructive of the kinaesthetic "feel" of a word. (Thus "bark" and "barque" have almost identical movements of the vocal organs, except that, usually, "barque" has a longer vowel movement.) This kinaesthetic change derives from the "free images" of the referents; the short auditory image of the dog's sound and the flowing visual-kinaesthetic imagery of the ship. But here again, of course, the kinaesthetic "feel" of either word would be modified by the total context.

The presence of so many variants, therefore, should deter anyone from attempting a superficial "vocabulary" of movements equated with specific words. The kinaesthesia of "Now" is considerably different in, "Now is the winter of our discontent," from "Now entertain conjecture of a time."

The notion of the role as a rhythmic entity, a transformation of the actor's structure of activity, relieves acting theory of the "problem" of style. When the matter of acting is seen as a question of two ultimate factors, an actor and a set of symbols, the text, the question of the "Actor-Character" duality dissolves. It is the fallacious practice of imagining a "character" as a self-supportive entity equivalent to a human being which creates the "problem" of style. If the student is encouraged as an *early* technique of his inventive activity to construct an image of the role as another human being whom he must impersonate, all formal devices of the author will appear as artificial distortions of the "natural" behavior of the "character." But, the student taught to work directly from the form of the text, employing the kinaesthetic imagination of the direct activity of the words finds the rhythms that result are transforming his behavior radically and spontaneously. By such experience the student can readily appreciate, for example, that the fluid verse structure of the Nurse in *Romeo and Juliet*, Act I.3.17, is as constructive of "character" as are the rapid changes of interest displayed by the "content." Similarly, the strict verse structure of Lady Capulet in the same scene contributes equally to the rhythms of that role, working in the actress a structure of activity appropriate to a "mind" formally educated, as do the uses in the speech of the extended conceit on the lover as a book. The fluidity of the Nurse patterns appears superficially as more "natural" than the couplets of Lady Capulet, but to the actor trained to view all dramatic texts as symbolic devices, there is no such confusion. Of course, as Rosamund Tuve³³ has shown, such modern distinctions as "natural," versus "artificial" or "formal," were foreign to the thought of Shakespeare's time. "Soul is form and doth the body make" wrote

³³ Rosamund Tuve, *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery* (University of Chicago Press, 1947).

Spenser. It is a notion more appreciated today, accustomed as we are to such sophisticated gadgeteering as lasers and other items of atomic technology; where modifications of the form of the "vibratory ebb and flow" deliver new entities.³⁴ It permits us to grasp the precision of Shakespeare's description of the actor's art, which forces the soul to his *own* conceit. It is clear why Stark Young³⁵ chose Spenser's line to illuminate the meaning of style.

³⁴ How far the new physics has penetrated into popular notions may be gauged by the fact that the comedian, Bill Cosby, uses the idea of an abrupt change of "rhythm pattern" as the basis of a comic skit, *Half Man*, Warner Bros. Album W 1567.

³⁵ Stark Young, *The Theatre* (New York, 1961), p. 108.

GROUP II
Conference
Report

FRANCIS HODGE
Theatre and Its Developing Audience

The Panel:

BERNARD BECKERMAN, U.S.A., *Chairman*

IRVING BROWN, U.S.A.
ARTHUR COLE, U.S.A.
EMILE DUFOUR, *Chile*
AARON FRANKEL, U.S.A.
E. GUIBUORG, *Argentina*
FERENC HONT, *Hungary*

SOMBHU MITRA, *India*
MILAN LUKES, *Czechoslovakia*
MILTON LYON, U.S.A.
HUMBERTO ORSINI, *Venezuela*
MARY H. WOLF, U.S.A.
PETER ZEISLER, U.S.A.

Pattern and Range of the Dialogue

ALTHOUGH THE DISCUSSION PURSUED FROM TIME TO TIME SOME PERIPHERAL ISSUES, particularly related to national cultural differences and educational processes, the dialogue centered primarily around five main points:

- I. Description of present theatre operations as they concern differing national audiences.
- II. The philosophical and theoretical bases for the theatre's relationship to its audiences.
- III. What is being done to introduce young people to and involve them in theatre?
- IV. Must current conventions be broken to reach audiences?
- V. What can be done in the way of international exchange to develop audiences?

Because of the wide range of national participation—India, Hungary, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Venezuela, and the United States, together with the diverse state of development of theatre in each of the countries represented, the discussions became more a rich interchange of ideas about theatre audiences rather than argument over theory and approach. One significant omission in the dialogue was decided upon at the outset: commercial promotional procedures to build audiences were not the concerns of the panel, which should turn its attention to larger issues. Theatre is an artistic and sociological matter, ranging far deeper than the business operations on the surface. The discussion that followed this decision, therefore, was concerned with theatre organization in society and man's need

for it as an artistic and humanistic experience. The panel also recognized frequently the lack of factual materials and scientific studies of audiences, a fact that forced it to depend on personal experiences and information available to panel members.

I. *Description of Present Theatre Operations*

1. *Hungary* (Mr. Hont): Theatre is a means to education and exists at all levels. Out of 10,000,000 population, 6½ million go to the theatre. Workers make up 52-60% of the audiences. Marionettes and puppets are for children, and inexpensive regular theatre has been arranged for secondary school students. In all Eastern European countries theatres are full because admissions are low, perhaps a dollar. The state makes this possible through subsidy. For remote audiences, and those who have seen very little theatre, twelve traveling troupes are maintained who play in small villages where audiences are particularly interested in classical drama: Shakespeare, Molière; occasionally Ibsen and works of Miller and Williams are played. Theatre audiences are maintained at a high level by audience organizations which buy up blocks of seats. Frequently after performances the producer, the actors, and the audience discuss the play. The task of the artistic personnel is to "activate the public."

2. *Chile* (Mr. Dufour): The University of Chile sponsors the state theatre. In addition to the regular city productions in Santiago, universities are responsible for bringing theatre to audiences in general. They prepare repertory troupes to perform for school children, high school audiences, and factory groups. In the latter, amateur organizations are set up to perform their own plays. Mr. Dufour supervises 400 of these. Advanced acting students from the Institute are used to supplement professional actors available, but the supply is small and thus it is difficult to take a company abroad because it robs the production effort at home. When not playing in the cities, the company performs for the disadvantaged. "It is not the play that develops their enthusiasm, though we have done classical as well as modern; all get the same reaction: they love the spectacle, they laugh at the comedy, they love the scenery—very interesting from a social point of view."

Theatre production is largely subsidized by State funds through the University of Chile, though some of the company are paid from box-office receipts. The program is 26 years old. Four main plays must be done every year, plus additional plays for high schools. Size of audience? 50,000 out of 3,000,000 saw *Marat/Sade*. In addition to this State-supported operation there are six or seven commercial theatre groups that perform regularly but do not go beyond their permanent quarters.

3. *India* (Mr. Mitra): At least 80-90% of the people in the area in which I work go to the theatre at least once a year. Traveling groups tour the country, setting up temporary stages and performing wherever they can find audiences. Plays are given a contemporary quality, although their stories may be based on fantasies or myths. The problem: there is a real conflict going on between those who would vulgarize audiences and those who would try to raise the level—reflect life and dreams. "How can the finer sensibilities of man be developed by theatre?" is the question seriously committed theatre people are always asking.

4. *Venezuela* (Mr. Orsini): Venezuela belongs to the middle group of South American countries that is just beginning to develop theatre. In Caracas there are four theatre centers and eighteen groups, and there are about ten groups in the provinces. Only one company is subsidized by the state plus the University theatre which is more or less professional. Although there are plans for theatre construction and for reaching the disadvantaged, at present the facilities for theatrical presentation are very limited.

5. *Czechoslovakia* (Mr. Lukes): For the approximately 15,000,000 population there are about 100 professional theatres, including drama, opera, ballet, and puppet theatre companies. Prague with a population of more than 1,000,000 has twenty permanent repertory theatres. All theatres are subsidized by the state either directly or indirectly, although from a certain point all theatres must be self-supporting. Some attempts were made some years ago to send traveling troupes to outlying districts, but this has been abandoned. However, most people can see theatre because the distance is not great to the nearest regional theatre center. A few young native playwrights have achieved prominence, among whom are Mr. Topol, Mr. Smocek, and Mr. Havel.

6. *United States* (Mr. Beckerman): A decade and a half ago audiences could attend the professional commercial theatre, for the most part in New York, or the non-professional university and community theatres. Today audiences have increased opportunities for playgoing through resident theatres, professional university theatres, festival theatres, etc. Moreover, private and public agencies have undertaken the responsibility for bringing theatre to communities which had little or no access to live performances. Particular emphasis has been placed on giving school children opportunities to see plays. Our concern with developing audiences arises not only from the increasing availability of theatrical presentations, but also because experimental efforts to restructure or alter the fundamental relationship between audience and performer are under way. These deserve careful consideration. One comment must be made, however: in comparison to what was accomplished in expanding audiences before the present trend, the changes have been major and heartening. Yet, in comparison to what remains to be done to reach a substantial segment of our population, we have barely started.

On the basis of the descriptions of national theatres, reported in précis above, a possible correlation appears between support of theatre by the state or other public funds and size of the audience and frequency of its attendance. One exception may be that of the theatre in India, where large audiences for contemporary productions exist beside those for traditional religious and quasi-theatrical presentations. Probably public support and ready accessibility to the theatre made possible by a low-priced ticket policy must be combined with artistic freedom in order to provide favorable conditions for attendance.

II. *The Philosophical and Theoretical Bases for the Theatre's Relationship to its Audience*

The dialogue on this topic plunged the panel directly into the aims and objectives of theatre operation. The intention was to discover whether the theatre has anything to offer that could not be provided by other media, and to

assess how meaningful theatre is in society. Only by examining this, it was thought, could the panel determine why an audience goes to the theatre, and when it does, what it gets out of it. The discussion ranged widely, but on one point there was firm agreement: we are not interested in making a purely commercial theatre with diversion its only aim; but the opposite is not a didactic theatre. A theatre must contain sensuousness, spectacle, and idea, and at the same time, like all art experience, seek to penetrate man's inner core.

Here are some of the comments made in this discussion.

1. We must talk of concrete problems. We don't want to create a commercial theatre. We must make organizations first that can support themselves and then turn these theatres over to artists who will find the sort of theatre that can enrich the public. These methods could differ in every country.

2. Theatre is a great medium of sociability. It brings people together and does not isolate them as does television, a lonely experience. When the spectator is part of a group he does not lose his individuality. He looks with his own eyes, simultaneously becoming a social-individual.

3. Theatre is in danger in modern society and must prove the reasons for its existence.

4. Theatre is not a mere matter of incidents, not a report of incidents that have happened, because a newspaper report then would be the highest form of art. The incidents become meaningful through the creative processes of art.

5. Theatre is life confrontation in action. Life's deepest pleasure is education; theatre takes education and turns it into life.

6. The conflicts of revolution are expressed in theatre because the creative artist has sensibilities. By understanding and absorbing surrounding experience he cannot help but reflect it in his art. What better form do we have to express our ideas?

7. The theatre is nourished in the drama of man, and its personages live on stage and in a universe of which man is the center. The spectator grasps in the theatre a vision of the world in which he recognizes himself and in which he participates. When the public rediscovers in the theatre a reply to its immediate problems, it will become more interested in the theatre and thus will attend in larger numbers.

On these ideas the panel was in complete agreement. The dialogue on this subject was perceptive and penetrating. Often it was very personal.

Mr. Hont: We need scientific research so that we will know the tastes of the public and point out what the public wants. We have made several surveys in this connection. We are carrying out one now in my Institute. It is a representative survey taken among 15,000 people, and we have learned from this survey and from other surveys we have made that people who filled out the questionnaire tell lies, because if you ask, "Who is your favorite dramatist?" he writes, "Shakespeare," or "Molière," and then he goes to a musical. So now we draw up questionnaires with rather indirect questions. For example—"What is the strongest emotion you feel in the theatre?" He will choose something he actually lived through. Then there are also experiments in Denmark—psychological experiments. How does the public react to a performance? The results have shown the strongest reaction is not to television shows, but to the theatre. Now if we wish

to do something that is serious we must do it on a scientific basis afterwards. Then it would be an artistic task; the creators in the theatre will know what the public wants, and it is up to them to find what the public needs. This is an artistic task—this is talent.

Mr. Orsini: Of course we are trying to get more audience. We are working on and we are talking about this problem of new audience, but when we say new audience, it is not a philosophy—it is a need, but what for? We must clarify this point—what for, new audiences? Just to bring people to the theatre—just to resolve the economic problem of theatre, or what for? For instance, we can bring more people to the theatre if we talk down. For example, the kind of theatre that TV gives (we have in Caracas 5 channels) and the melodramatics there are destroying the minds of people, but it is said these programs have big audiences. The producers and people who pay for this kind of program want this kind! People crying all the time—old women crying—this is destroying the minds; it is terrible! This comes inside our homes—the people do not go outside to see it. Perhaps the reason people do not come to the theatre is that they know this kind of theatre through television. If we did this kind of thing we could get more audience, but I do not want this kind of audience in this way. So, we have to answer “What is the responsibility of theatre?” Is it to an audience or is it to the masses? I feel this is our responsibility so that I am trying to find types of amusement where people have a feeling of well-being and are enjoying life. I am trying, not in a political way, but in a humane way to make a humane man. This is the spirit in which I am trying to work. It is not easy. We need more audiences. What is the responsibility of the theatre in this way? Conduct performances from which people go out feeling better in a didactic way? In this way I consider the theatre as school. Theatre must combine all these elements, so, again, “What for audience?” Is it to change humanity or is it to get better economic results in theatres? Every artist wants to change the world—humanity must be better. How can they become better? This I am trying to clarify to myself. Theatre could be one element of changing humanity. I should like to hear, when we said “new audiences,” why new audiences. We have to go to whole masses to help them, or are they going to help us?

Mr. Hont: I think that we must talk of concrete problems. I think we are all in agreement we do not want to create a commercial theatre in which the public is just amused and it stops there. The question is organization. How can we compete with commercial theatre, and I think this is of primordial importance. We can put on good theatre if the artists and the businessmen are desiring the theatre—the artists and the population together. Therefore we must look in all countries to the possibility of establishing organizations with or without State support, and try to see how it would be possible for the theatre to act as a means for the artist—not as a means for making money. I think this is the fundamental problem. In some countries we have found solutions. I think forty or more years ago in Germany large organizations were set up where they owned the companies. There were 55 theatres owned by the public, so means can be found. I think first we need organization and then afterwards we can try to see what kind of theatre must be given to the public, but this question will be different in every country. I am quite in agreement with Mr. Dufour that we must not establish

purely classical or purely modern repertory. What is yesterday? If we have plays which are really good they will be good tomorrow too.

Mr. Lukes: I quite agree on the need to be specific on this situation. Maybe some of our experiences in Czechoslovakian theatre can be quite useful—in fact, after World War II, we established theatre on a wide pontifical level to trap the audience, and we succeeded. But the theatre which we established was supposed to be a theatre for everybody (as one of our outstanding Czechoslovakian comedians has put it—that our theatre is a theatre even accessible to a rhinoceros. We can't expect one to come, but should he come he would be able to understand it.)

There were no artistic means of differentiating theatres—in fact, they may have been according to size, or quality (because in some there were better actors and in some, worse) but the ideas were so familiarized that there was only one institutionalized theatre all over the country. In the late 50's new theatre organisms began to emerge, in many cases semi-professional, non-regimented, and which just drew a very limited number of people together. People who understood each other, who shared a more specific concrete vision, were able to express that vision in a very definitive way, and they started from the very beginning of theatre. They didn't, possibly, even have a building. They had to find one. They had no audience. They had to find one—to find people who would be able to share their vision, and at this point a revolution started in this country and has brought the Czechoslovakian theatre to a very high level now.

This, to my mind, is a very important point. Our problem is not to make the theatre more accessible to multitudes. The way is not to make it accessible to multitudes—not to deal in generalities, but to give very specific things to specific people who can enjoy them. This means artists and discriminating people.

Mr. Mitra also made an extended comment on this subject. It is quoted in full in the "Soliloquies and Passage-at-Arms" section of the report.

III. What Is Being Done to Introduce Young People to and Involve Them in Theatre?

Perhaps this point was suggested because of the peculiar dilemma in the United States where theatregoing among young people is very limited. Although the U.S. panel members realized that solutions to the problem in other countries could probably not be applied to the U.S., examination from a comparative point of view was considered important if only to obtain perspective on their own views of why young people seem to be out of touch with the theatre. In some ways this point provided a look at the "new" or potential audience.

To facilitate discussion, an arbitrary age limit of sixteen to twenty-six was set, but this soon proved meaningless. Some members of the panel could not understand the age bracket because once the theatre habit was established, age did not apply. If exposure to theatre and to the theatre idea was begun early enough, some thought regular theatregoing could be established as habitual much earlier than the suggested age limits. It was soon revealed that despite the progress made in the U.S. during the last few years through educational programs, private theatre operations such as the American Shakespeare Festival's

youth program that brings 150,000 children a year to Stratford, and federal government pilot projects, the U.S. has a long way to go to catch up to most European standards.

In Hungary, for instance, there is a concerted plan of theatre exposure beginning in the kindergarten and proceeding through high school that extensively exposes the student to theatre and makes him a theatregoer by the time he reaches high school. A teenage theatre project was abandoned, reported Mr. Hont, because the students were going to regular professional theatres where special matinees were arranged for them. A new form that has had widespread use, he noted, is the literary revue—short satiric scenes put together by students with song and music worked around a central theme. Trials, involving the re-playing of real-life legal cases, are also staged, as are political debates contributing to law-making. This constant exposure to dramatic materials induces intense theatre interest in students. The low cost of theatre tickets permits regular attendance.

South America also presents a contrast. While in Chile a program of professionally acted plays are taken regularly to the schools and lectures on theatre subjects are given, with both programs stretched as far as resources permit, in Venezuela not much has yet been done. "The first thing we have to do," commented Mr. Orsini, "is to educate the professors, as they are not informed and keep silent. We must do our best to get the Minister of Education to interest children in theatre, from primary to university level." However, there are several puppet groups in Caracas, about 15 groups of amateurs that play in high schools, one group of amateurs in the University and four elsewhere.

Historically in the United States, reported Mr. Lyon, the accepted attitude had been that the arts were at the periphery rather than at the center of American life. Although music and the graphic arts entered the main stream of education approximately fifty years ago, theatre did not begin to take its place with the other arts until the last decade. Among other projects in this new development is Florida's professional company which plays primarily in the schools. The pilot project in Pittsburgh, where actors are used in the classroom to present certain materials from history and literature, provides a new view of what can be done. Both California and New York are considering the possibilities of touring companies operating for the schools from centrally located junior colleges. The hope was expressed that state arts councils would increasingly comprehend the theatre problem and take steps to organize live professional theatre tours.

Before the discussion ended, Mr. Mitra said that in India children were exposed to theatre regularly from childhood and he could not see why it should be such a problem elsewhere. It is obvious that unless the theatre idea is made an important and integral part of the cultural pattern, unless it is viewed as a necessary part of basic education, it will have only a peripheral position in society.

The young must be given basic knowledge to develop their understanding of the theatre and give to those who have the "gift" the means of participating in the theatre by introducing into the teaching programs, especially primary and secondary school, courses on the theatre and in theatre history specifically.

The panel agreed that there must be opportunity for the youngster to come

into contact with the theatre both as a participant and as a spectator from the earliest age. However, there should be no divorce between a theatre for children and one for adults. There is nothing wrong in having a children's theatre to initiate a child into the theatre, but there should be a close correlation between such theatres and the theatre of the populace as a whole.

IV. *Must Current Convention Be Broken to Reach Audiences?*

It was this discussion that produced the bomb. After the positive descriptions of a living and vital theatre around the world, after the heady idealism and self-justification on the need and purpose for theatre, and after the energetic schemes and plans for getting young people into the theatre through early exposure to its artistic sorrows and joys, some panel members reluctantly but honestly admitted that there was one thing they do not like about the theatre: it bores them. Something has gone out of theatre, was the reiteration—the fun, the sense of play, the joy, the intense feeling, the shock, the surprise. Why go to the theatre and particularly why encourage young people to do so when, to be honest about it, an evening spent in a theatre too often results in plain boredom?

Rumblings of this began early in the discussions when Mary Hunter Wolf voiced a strong feeling that our theatre offered very little to young people, that the older generation was out of touch with their search, that we had not made a place for them. When "Happenings" were introduced into the discussion as a manifestation of this unrest—this seeming search for a lost sense of "play" in the theatre idea—some members of the panel seriously questioned whether that form had introduced anything that was new, whether it wasn't something that was more associated with some of the past theatre fringe such as the "DaDa" movement. Mrs. Wolf asserted that however that might be, what she had seen in the Jerome Robbins experiments convinced her of their validity not only as present intensive theatre experience in itself, but as artistic experience that seemed to be opening doors for young people.

On a later occasion when the question of whether present dominating conventions had to be broken in order to attract audiences strongly again to the theatre was introduced, the discussion took a different form. Mr. Lyons stated, "The theatre of the twentieth century, unlike the previous centuries, is composed of not one but three media: "live" theatre, cinema, and television. The "live" theatre, then, is no longer the sole producer of the theatrical experience. Therefore, it becomes mandatory, if the "live" theatre is to retain or regain its audience, that that media distill from the aesthetic components of the theatre experience those aesthetics which are most pertinent to the "live" theatre experience and heighten, expand, and theatricalize these aesthetics." Mr. Frankel thought that in some ways the theatre did not participate in the twentieth century nearly so much as did TV and film. He also suggested that theatre might be losing its audience to the art film. Mr. Cole supported both views: "We need to examine those things we can do well that electronics cannot do." Mr. Mitra, however, thought that distilling differences was far too complicated for the panel to go into now. We need to work on what we have, he said, audience-stage interaction. That was the more appropriate discussion.

Mr. Orsini again began to voice the "lost" feeling about the theatre experience. "We have to find a theatre of change," he said. "The propaganda theatre is dead, as well as other forms. We've got to match the advance in science—the velocity of the modern era." Mrs. Wolf said, "Human values may remain fundamentally the same. We breathe, we love, we die, but we 'experience' our relationships somewhat differently today. There are observable changes in the reactions of youth today. We need new ways to create experience in 'theatre.' Artists will find them. But let's not stand in the way by saying these ways are not theatre." And Mr. Beckerman noted that as life becomes more complicated we have to strip away non-essentials in the art experience. We are still human beings, and basic human experience is still valid if we can find ways of expressing it.

In contrast, Mr. Lukes demurred at the thought of losing, for instance, contact with different ways and forms of theatrical expression as established in the past. One cannot be sure which particular form of technical expression is definitely dead; it might be easily brought back to life by a need of expressing a new social and ethical content. The wisdom of historical experience of the theatre cannot be ignored. Matching the advance in science does not necessarily mean creating a brand new up-to-date theatre. History of the theatre, its drama and its theatrical conventions, he argued, simply cannot be ignored even though we must search for and find new and different ways of producing plays.

It was at this point that a panel guest, Duncan Ross, made the statement, "I am bored at theatre," which set off a number of assertions in this direction. "I am not bored in rehearsal," Ross said, "where I find the business of struggling through the making of a character exciting, but I am bored at the repetition of it after it is made." Improvisational passages of plays are much more interesting, he suggested. "Here may be one way—to see people struggling at the moment with something. We need the theatre because of the vocal flights, because of the enormous coloration available only in that form. But the spectator knows what is going to happen. There is no surprise." Mrs. Wolf supported the point: "We are aware of this deadening that is happening. Something has gone wrong. Repetition has lost something as theatre experience." "I am never bored at Olivier," said Ross. "He has managed to capture some element of danger. He takes risks." In looking at acting in general, Ross felt that television has made us much more demanding of the truth and spontaneity in actors; we are aware of this aspect and we will not take empty formalism.

Mr. Orsini again voiced his position. "We must have change. We must express human elements, and electronics may help us express our ideas better." At this point, Mr. Mitra who has worked in both film and stage, suggested that perhaps we need newer forms, but only the artist can create them. When we talk about audience participation, theatre artists must evolve a form to involve the audience.

Mr. Lukes also admitted to being bored in the theatre from time to time, even to falling asleep. But he didn't believe that was possible when theatre was at its best, as in the Berliner Ensemble productions—certainly one of the best acting companies in Europe—or with Krejca's production of *Three Sisters*. People are bored, he said, because they cannot follow the process, the striving. "When I go to the theatre I want a free space where I can enter freely into the play. This

is my participation." A couple of sessions earlier he had said, when the point of audience participation came up, that in Czechoslovakia, audiences did not seem to be interested in any direct, physical participation but only in "inner participation," and Irving Brown suggested that in some new forms, *Marienbad* for example, he, as a spectator, was constantly busy throughout searching for interconnections, trying to pull together the many impressions that he found he was being constantly exposed to. "A play works," said Mr. Frankel, "when the audience finds its role, when the audience is concerned throughout." But he protested at the communal confession of boredom around the table. "If, as theatre leaders we are bored with theatre, what are we doing about it? That must be the question!"

In concluding the session Mr. Beckerman asked for and seemed to get a consensus on the statement that we would agree that there was an essential disquiet about the theatre, that it was somehow failing to give us the intensity of the theatre experience we expected. The answer, however, does not lie in mere formalistic change.

V. *What Can Be Done in the Way of International Exchange to Develop Audience?*

There seemed to be general accord on the panel for an active program of interchange of companies, and both individual artists and teachers, in order to extend the taste of audiences. To this end there is need for centralized information and administrative assistance in increasing these exchanges. This becomes truly significant when the exchange achieves a true people-to-people relationship.

Panel Statement in Conclusion

The panel wishes to place on record its conviction that opportunities to attend theatre are as vital to individual and social development as opportunities to attend educational institutions or to secure books at a public library, and, therefore, affirms that it is society's responsibility to guarantee all its citizens the opportunities to have such experiences.

Postscript

A Statement

by MILAN LUKES

Returning in my mind to the discussions we had in Washington, it seems even more difficult, in this belated monologue, to say something that would be more than just a set of platitudes or again a dry report about the specific situation here at home. And, of course, "the theatre audience" is always a particularly unrewarding subject, if for no other reason, than because we are here in fact dealing with two unknown factors: for who would like to attempt the experiment of defining what is theatre and what is the audience?

I don't know about the United States, but in Europe, or to be more precise, in Czechoslovakia problems of the theatre audience are nevertheless a popular subject for reflections of varying pertinence and quality. This no doubt is due to the fact that in theatrical theory, as in a discipline with scientific aspirations, we are strongly aware that these two "unknown factors" are indivisibly linked: i.e., that it is only in cooperation with the audience that the theatrical artifact begins to have its being. This is certainly true of every stage performance which takes place at a certain time not only *in front of* but also *with the participation of* a certain audience. But it is equally true of every theatre—whether we understand this to mean institution or an organism which originates, develops and declines, which is a definition I myself prefer. The collective character of the drama, which is generally acknowledged and frequently emphasized, does not lie merely in the fact that the actor cooperates with the author, producer and designer, but primarily in that those responsible for the production cooperate with the audience. The importance and the creative character of this cooperation, without which no true art can be created, is exactly what distinguishes the theatre from the other arts.

If we accept this as an axiom—and there is nothing to prevent us from doing so—we must draw the logical conclusions arising from it. If this cooperation is to be truly creative, that is if a work of art is really to come of it and to become part of a certain development, such cooperation cannot be merely accidental and isolated. It must have a stable character, both on the part of the theatre and on that of the public. This stability, I hasten to add, can only arise over a period of time: the theatre stabilizes itself by creating its own public, and the public stabilizes itself by creating its own theatre; the theatre develops hand in hand with the development of its audience.

A mutual, bi-lateral process of appropriating takes place between the theatre and its public. We are quite used to speaking of a certain theatre and *its* public, but we might just as easily speak of a certain public and *its* theatre: the possessive pronouns provide adequate testimony to the social character of the theatre.

These pronouns as well as adjectives such as "certain," which we automatically link with the words "theatre" and "public," further testify to the fact that both these concepts are today thought of as being diversified rather than homogeneous. "The theatre" is a collective concept whose content is growing increasingly wider. We are far more able to define the characteristic features of ancient Greek or Elizabethan theatre, which we cannot know from our own experience, than the characteristic features of the theatre of the time and country we ourselves happen to be living in. The modern world brings with it ever greater specialization and differentiation—i.e., particularization—so that we no longer have the concrete universal features of olden times. The image characteristic of the dynamics of the theatre's development today is a lively growth of branches rather than a thickening of the bole.

Under these circumstances it is of course quite out of the question to treat the audience in general terms. Even the simplest social research will show how the differentiation of theatres' advances in parallel with the differentiation of the audience. The wide range of theatrical views and expression which is today

characteristic of countries with a highly developed theatre culture, splits the abstract mass of the public into a large number of concrete groups, among which and inside which there is of course constant movement. The theatregoer chooses his theatre: this choice is once of the ways in which he can establish his own identity, in which he declares his individuality—but a social individuality, capable of congregating with others and sharing a common vision.

Just as the Greek ideal of democracy is different from the modern ideal, so the democratic character of modern theatre has been modified. The democratic character of the theatre of our time does not consist only in that the unique experience of participation in artistic creation is—or at least should be—accessible to all, but particularly in that it enables the spectator to participate in the kind of creation consistent with his own mental and emotional *niveau*. It is from this point of view, the point of view of possible choice, that the level of theatre culture in a country bears witness to the level of democracy achieved by its people in a certain historical period.

Theatre culture can today become a mass culture only *in toto*, in the sum of the possibilities it offers; it is, however, impossible to try and make every one of its products—any single theatre or any single production, as the case may be—attractive for everybody. After all, the theatre does not manufacture mass-produced goods, it produces originals.

This fact is of particular significance at a time when the intellectual and emotional horizon of a large part of the population is determined by television: a medium which has now achieved such wide distribution and influence as no other medium before it. However, even in the case of television—and in particular of those of its programs which correspond approximately to the theatre—experience shows that efforts to reach “the average” viewer, the viewer “as such,” efforts to please every member of the audience irrevocably lead to a devaluation of standards to the lowest common denominator, this is only too horribly real, while the average remains imaginary. If the future of television lies in specialization, in establishing a number of different programs and different channels for various sections of the public, i.e., in a true and effective choice of the kind of program each particular viewer wishes to see, and if film distribution is guided by the same law of differentiation, then the selfsame requirement is a categorical imperative for the theatre of the near future. By means of such differentiation the theatre can successfully compete with its closest rivals, being a far more elastic medium than they: of course, on condition that it is relieved of the one-sided dictate of economic reproduction.

The practitioners of show business who rely on “the average spectators” defend their standpoint by claiming that they are giving their audience exactly what it wants. They are right, but only partly so, if they are thinking in terms of satisfying a *demand* which, as experienced businessmen will no doubt agree, can be considerably regulated, manipulated, and even artificially created with the aid of modern means of mass communication. Economists and philosophers, however, tell us that it is necessary to distinguish *demand* and *need*. This very real spiritual need, a real interest on the part of the public in things of the spirit remains unsatisfied by this kind of superficial gratification of a manipulated demand.

It is well known that the fate of a play is decided by the immediate verdict

of the public, far more emphatically and irrevocably than is the case in any other branch of the arts. Thus it is desirable that the contact between the work of art, the play, and its "consumers" should be as direct as possible: if, however, it cannot do without the kind of publicity which sells the genuine article as if it were tinsel while offering tinsel as if it were pure gold, and if the fate of a play is decided already in the reviews of half a dozen witty, perhaps even intelligent but at the same time inevitably fallible critics, then we are faced with a situation in which the assessment, or to put it more accurately, the verification of the genuine needs of the audience is made so difficult as to be well-nigh impossible.

The question thus remains: is it really possible to discover what are those spiritual requirements of the audience? Social research carried out by means of questionnaires ending with the query "What kind of play would you like to see on the stage?" cannot supply the answer. It is as clear as daylight that the public can only demand that which it already knows: its need of new experience can only be stated in general terms. The man of the theatre thus ought to and must not rely on the kind of help asked for by the manufacturer of consumer goods—unless, of course, he wishes to become one. Social research can at most serve to confirm the existing state of affairs (which, however, he ought to know intimately to begin with), as regards the composition and aesthetic level of his public; it will not point the way to any development. The weight of responsibility for that development, which is at the same time also the development of his branch of art, cannot be lifted from his own shoulders: and it is here that the responsibility of the artist towards society as a whole finds its true meaning.

Postscript

A Statement

by AARON FRANKEL

Fearing to overlap with the panel on education, I think we have overlooked one point belonging to our panel: how much education develops audiences. Here I mean education as the result of experience, as finally self-education. Do we not need to recognize education as the life process itself, to acknowledge that audiences reach their finest sensibilities (Mitra's repeated phrase) because theatre is the drama and often the sum of what life teaches? I think we neglected aspects of this.

I add my appreciation, as a representative of professional theatre fortunate to work in universities, of the increasing professional-university rapprochement in America, in which we have been behind the rest of the world so far. This is another boost to the development of audiences.

Corollary is the question of training. I think our fear again of overlapping with another panel led us to an omission. Are audiences not indeed always being trained, innocently or not, in one way or another? For what could they be

trained? How? And how are we trained in turn by them? For what should we be trained? At bottom, what audience needs—more, possibilities—should govern all training?

Another matter we touched on but did not develop—how the uses of all the arts develops audiences for each art and for all of them. The arts exchange and increase audiences for each other. How this may develop theatre audiences is one question here, and the theatre's own encompassing of several arts is another. (The more music and dance in theatre, the larger and more lifted its audiences—true from the theatre's beginnings.)

In fine, I now see one question in our discussions emerging as basic, though not the only basic one. On the one hand does developing audiences mean increasing their numbers? Accordingly, ought the theatre to find some way of joining up as one of the 20th century mass media? Or on the other hand does developing audiences mean increasing their sensibilities? Accordingly, ought the theatre to guard its life against becoming a mass medium, advancing itself instead as blessed by its limits? Once again that question rears: is the theatre needed?

Is it posed right? After all, any enterprise which justifies itself only by its commercial consumption endangers itself. Risk for profit or loss is a living only. Theatre as show business has long been its less creative power; show business has never been enough to justify its human business. "Ripeness is all." Larger audiences, then, or acuter ones? Must we find them or create them? Choose between them or reconcile them? May these be some of the questions to keep the 20th century theatre healthy, pertinent, even redeeming?

Conclusion. Isn't the question of audiences the seed subject, a conference theme all its own? We all come from audiences, must take our lives from them, must give life back to them. An audience in the theatre co-creates the play. Every performance it serves as co-author. Are not some of the questions in Group II's entire report worth a whole conference, the starting question of all: audiences as the reason for our being?

Thank you for permitting me this amendment.

Postscript

Theatre and Public in Hungary

by FERENC HONT

In 1945 right after the liberation of the country the Hungarian theatres had two objectives. At first the number of theatre-goers had to be vastly increased. In pre-war Hungary workers, peasants and lower middle class intellectuals could hardly afford to go to the theatre. And then, secondly, the new public had to be assisted in a way to develop them into a regular and expert theatrical audience.

In fulfilling the first objective impressive successes were achieved in the past twenty-two years. Now twenty-seven theatre companies operate in the country,

fifteen of them in the capital, Budapest. Most of these companies have two theatre buildings, a smaller and a bigger one, and companies in the country have a dramatic, an opera, and operetta and at times a ballet company. One of the companies, Faluszínház (Village Theatre) has twelve smaller groups which tour small towns and villages all over the country. The companies of bigger towns also pay regular visits to neighboring smaller communities, giving the same but somewhat scaled down performances of plays they present in their theatre.

In the past few years in one season the average number of theatre-goers in a country of ten million inhabitants was nearly seven million. It is a fairly large number (considering for example that in Canada only 2% of the population went to the theatre in one year), but we should like to increase it further. To achieve this we have tried to raise the interest in the theatre among the people. The rapid spread of amateur groups in the country was a great help. There are hundreds of such amateur companies in Hungary. These amateur players developed a strong liking for the theatre and became a solid part of the theatrical public.

The professional companies were not idly waiting for the coming of the new public but went to the factories and the villages to show themselves to the future theatre-goers.

The companies did their best to give a memorable experience to those coming to the theatre for the first time. These professional companies make contracts with actors not for the production of one play but for one up to five seasons. (State award winners are employed on a permanent basis without time limit.) Having a considerable variety of actors and actresses these companies were able to break with the "en suite" system and became genuine repertory companies. So in this country most of the theatres offer a modern play on one day, a classical tragedy on the other, and an opera on the next.

Finally the most effect means to promote the increase of the theatrical public is the price policy. Since 1949 all the theatres are in the property of the state of the city. The average price of a ticket is from 75 cents to one dollar. The balance of the income and the total expenditure is subsidized by the state.

The second objective—that is—the gradual development of an expert public presented a more difficult task. To achieve this, the companies endeavored to present carefully produced, memorable performances of plays with a high literary value. These productions drew a larger public especially in the case of classical plays. A recent production of *Hamlet* for example drew 300 full houses in one of Budapest's major theatres. *Tartuffe* by Molière was played well over 1500 times in Hungary since 1945. Even village audiences attend the performances of plays by Sophocles, Shakespeare, Molière, Ibsen, Miller and Tennessee Williams.

To increase public knowledge of the theatre the Hungarian Institute for Theatrical Research was founded ten years ago. The Institute is carefully examining the development and change in the taste and demand of the public. Theatrical exhibitions are regularly presented, popular lectures are delivered by the hundreds, and all sorts of information media are made use of to popularize the theatre. Among other things the Institute publishes books on production, on new theories and on practically all aspects of the theatre. The Institute gives

assistance to the Hungarian and foreign theatres with its extensive International Theatrical Centre for Documentation and Information. This Centre has data on nearly all the theatrical productions of the world. Photos, criticisms and other documents are held of the works of more than eleven thousand playwrights. The relation of theatre and public is drawn even closer by the activization of the public: meetings of the artists with the audience, the organization of clubs for theatre fans. The development of the audience into an expert public is guaranteed by such meetings at which artists and public sincerely and freely exchange their views, teach, and learn from one another.

STATISTIQUE THÉÂTRALE HONGROISE DE 1963

1. Nombre de représentations dans les théâtres de Budapest:

	Au siège	En tournée régionale	Total
Théâtre National	317	—	317
Théâtre Katona József, Studio du Théâtre National	187	60	247
Théâtre de la Gaité	336	13	349
Théâtre Madách	314	2	316
Studio du Théâtre Madách	297	24	321
Théâtre József Attila	340	20	360
Théâtre Thália	301	28	329
Théâtre des Marionnettes	465	1000	1465
Théâtre Municipal d'Opérettes	287	—	287
Théâtre Petofi	300	2	302
Scène de la Gaité	289	2	291
Petite Scène	307	22	329
Scène Littéraire	135	139	274
Opéra National	288	—	288
Théâtre Erkel de l'Opéra National	284	—	284

2. Nombre des représentations dans les théâtres de province:

Théâtre National de Szeged	295	152	447
Studio du Théâtre National de Szeged	111	—	111
Théâtre National de Pécs	330	188	518
Théâtre Csokonai de Debrecen	285	180	465
Studio du Théâtre Csokonai de Debrecen	129	—	129
Théâtre National de Miskolc	294	133	427
Studio du Théâtre National de Miskolc	138	—	138
Théâtre Kisfaludy de Győr	270	168	438
Théâtre Katona József de Kecskemét	279	195	474
Théâtre Szigligeti de Szolnok	104	286	390
Théâtre Gárdonyi Géza d'Eger	202	189	391
Théâtre Csiky Gergely de Kaposvár	240	126	366
Théâtre Jókai du département Békés	178	281	459
Théâtre Déryné (Théâtre Rural)	33	1835	1868
Théâtre Petofi du département Veszprém	141	159	300

3. Nombre des spectateurs dans les théâtres du Budapest:

Théâtre National	255.964	—	255.964
Théâtre Katona József, Studio du Théâtre National	43.003	21.443	64.446
Théâtre de la Gaité	313.735	6.744	320.479

	Au siège	En tournée régionale	Total
Théâtre Madách	219,323	1,547	220,870
Studio du Théâtre Madách	113,998	15,841	129,839
Théâtre József Attila	206,060	11,049	217,109
Théâtre Thália	123,503	12,093	135,596
Théâtre des Marionnettes	128,184	310,584	438,767
Théâtre Municipal d'Opérettes	329,477	—	329,477
Théâtre Petöfi	155,653	1,014	156,667
Scène de la Gaîté	123,404	968	124,372
Petite Scène	97,913	11,086	108,999
Scène Littéraire	32,053	51,168	83,221
Opéra National	305,599	148,792	454,391

4. Nombre des spectateurs dans les théâtres de province:

Théâtre National de Szeged	150,359	54,397	204,756
Studio du Théâtre National de Szeged	18,846	—	18,846
Théâtre National de Pécs	151,756	53,453	205,209
Théâtre Csokonai de Debrecen	116,920	55,421	172,341
Studio du Théâtre Csokonai de Debrecen	33,219	—	33,219
Théâtre National de Miskolc	148,993	40,290	189,283
Studio du Théâtre National de Miskolc	26,151	—	26,151
Théâtre Kisfaludy de Győr	92,162	52,200	144,362
Théâtre Katona József de Kecskemét	134,402	64,681	199,683
Théâtre Szigligeti de Szolnok	37,410	66,188	103,598
Théâtre Gárdonyi Géza d'Eger	43,804	49,521	93,325
Théâtre Csiky Gergely de Kaposvár	107,144	38,659	145,803
Théâtre Jokai du département Békés	59,082	97,919	57,001
Théâtre Déryné (Théâtre Rural)	13,492	552,280	565,772
Théâtre Petöfi du département Veszprém	56,796	58,037	114,833

5. Nombre des premières dans les théâtres du Budapest:

86

Par théâtres:

Théâtre National	7
Théâtre Katona József, Studio du Théâtre National	7
Théâtre de la Gaîté	7
Théâtre Madách	4
Studio du Théâtre Madách	7
Théâtre József Attila	7
Théâtre Thália	6
Théâtre des Marionnettes	10
Théâtre Municipal d'Opérettes	3
Théâtre Petöfi	5
Scène de la Gaîté	3
Petite Scène	4
Scène Littéraire	8
Opéra National	6
Théâtre Erkel de l'Opéra National	2

6. Nombre des premières dans les théâtres de province:

184

Par théâtres:

Théâtre National de Szeged	18
Studio du Théâtre National de Szeged	5
Théâtre National de Pécs	20
Théâtre Csokonai de Debrecen	15

Studio du Théâtre Csokonai de Debrecen	5
Théâtre National de Miskolc	12
Studio du Théâtre National de Miskolc	2
Théâtre Kisfaludy de Győr	15
Théâtre Katona József de Kecskemét	14
Théâtre Szigligeti de Szolnok	12
Théâtre Gárdonyi Géza d'Eger	13
Théâtre Csiky Gergely de Kaposvár	13
Théâtre Jókai du département Békés	13
Théâtre Déryné (Théâtre Rural)	14
Théâtre du département Veszprém	13

7. Les pièces le plus souvent jouées en Hongrie (1960-1962)
(Les pièces signalées par + ont été présentées avant 1962)

PIECES EN PROSE

a) *Nouvelles pièces hongroises:*

	Nombre des représentations	Nombre des spectateurs
László Tabi: Intervalle mondial	796	257,385
László Tabi: Noces	287	130,635
Margit Gáspár: Hamlet n'a pas raison	286	104,964
Ferenc Örsi: Se montre le bout de l'oreille	268	40,615
József Darvas: Feu d'aube	251	108,510
Lajos Mesterházy: Le Onzième commandement	204	131,360
Klára Fehér: Il y a trop peu d'hommes	201	87,591
Mátyás Csizmarek: La Fillè de son père	196	50,916
Miklós Tóth: C'était un autre temps	177	37,816
József Darvas: Ciel fuligineux	153	71,635
Magda Simon: Noces à cent maisons	144	35,156
László Németh: Les Deux Bólyai	142	68,970
István Kállai: La Vérité vient à domicile	130	52,858
Ferenc Örsi: Noces d'or	122	30,606
György Sós: Le Boulanger	120	33,535
Tibor Nyíri: La Danse de la mariée	119	29,698
Klára Fehér: Le Bouquet de la création	106	43,279
Endre Illés: Amants impatients	95	47,177
Ferenc Örsi: Le Ventilateur noir	91	24,814
László Németh: Le Voyage	88	38,065
Lajos Mesterházy: Gens de Budapest	77	39,198
János Gosztonyi: A Coeur pur	73	40,497
Ferenc Dunai: Le Pantalon	71	36,432
István Kállai: Voltige	69	22,970
Béla Gábor: Une lacune dans l'autobiographie	69	22,362
Magda Szabó: La Morsure du serpent	67	29,915
Imre Sarkadi: Paradis perdu	62	23,233
Margit Gáspár: Guerre au ciel	60	30,964
György Sós: Kati	57	30,655
István Kállai: Saute par la fenêtre	55	32,824
Anna Barnassin: Eclipse solaire	55	16,078

b) *Anciennes oeuvres hongroises:*

+Mór Jókai-Mihály Földes: Les Fils de l'homme au coeur de pierre	417	191,516
+Jeno Heltai: Le cavalier muet	320	141,053
+Ede Szigligeti: Liliomfi	268	135,041

	Nombre des représentations	Nombre des spectateurs
+Sándor Bródy: L'industrie	239	56,204
Kálmán Mikszáth-Endre Bondy: Bourgeons de printemps	174	62,870
+Imre Madách: La Tragédie de l'homme	167	205,734
+Endre Nagy: Le Président du Conseil	162	53,838
+Mór Jókai: L'Homme en or	160	84,171
+Ferenc Molnár: Le Jeu dans un château	134	105,961
+Mór Jókai-Sándor Nevesi: Diamants noirs	119	30,576
+Zsigmond Móricz: Matyi, gardeur d'oies	114	62,475
+Jeno Heltai: Les Filles Tündérlaki	88	21,522
Géza Gárdonyi-Gyula Kárpáthy: Les Etoiles d'Eger	84	45,650
+Mór Jókai-László Bozó: La Femme blanche de Locse	65	16,485
+Zsigmond Móricz: Noces de seigneurs	63	19,650
+Mihály Vörösmarty: Csongor et Tünde	60	50,552
+Kálmán Mikszáth: Un étrange mariage	57	29,704
+Ferenc Molnár: Les Gars de la rue Pál	52	15,895
c) <i>Oeuvres étrangères modernes:</i>		
Arthur Miller: Vu du pont	277	177,713
Bertolt Brecht: L'Opéra de quat'sous	186	126,715
Sergei Mikhalkov: Echauffourée au lac Balaton	176	38,948
Victor Rozov: Les Enfants grandissent	144	66,068
William Gibson: Deux sur la balançoire	118	46,549
Bertolt Brecht: Le Cercle de craie caucasien	115	82,874
Alexis Arbousov: Histoire d'Irkoutsk	113	74,880
+Léonide Rakhmanov: Crépuscule orageux	113	31,106
Alejandro Cassona: Les Arbres meurent debout	111	47,213
Marcel Achard: Le plus bel amour du monde	110	46,391
Peter Karvas: Messe de minuit	107	33,212
Nikolas Pogodine: Les Aristocrates	99	48,776
Tchou-Chu-Tchen: Quinze guirlandes d'argent	96	31,000
Vassili Chkvarkine: La petite datcha	94	21,871
Arthur Miller: Les Sorcières de Salem	93	52,270
Alexis Arbousov: Tania	92	38,737
+John Boyton Priestley: Virage dangereux	90	41,191
Tennessee Williams: Un tramway nommé désir	86	73,302
Bertolt Brecht: La Résistible ascension d'Arturo Ui	79	37,826
+Pavel Kohut: Un si grand amour	78	55,167
+Rudolf Trinner: Ma femme n'est pas un ange	76	14,063
Frederick Knott: Meurtre sur ordre (Dial "M" For Murder)	73	9,650
+Vratislav Blazek: Cela tient du conte	70	21,891
Agatha Christie: La Souricière	66	37,398
Marcel Achard: L'Idiot	65	20,931
Erich Kaestner: La Miniature disparue	62	32,986
Victor Rosov: Le Gosse fait la cour	61	34,406
+Federico Garcia-Lorca: La maison de Bernarda Alba	59	12,374
+Vsevolod Vichnievski: Tragédie optimiste	54	21,851
Pierre Aristide Bréal: Edmée	54	19,524
Hedda Zinner: Le Café Peyer	52	27,728
Nicola Manzari: Ah, les enfants d'aujourd'hui	52	9,509
d) <i>Oeuvres classiques étrangères:</i>		
+Lope de Vega: Le Chien du jardinier	289	72,549
+Shakespeare: La Nuit des Rois	263	116,089
+Victor Hugo: Ruy Blas	189	70,807

	Nombre des représentations	Nombre des spectateurs
+Bernard Shaw: Pygmalion	176	65,102
+Victorien Sardou: Madame Sans-Gêne	157	78,386
+Friedrich Schiller: Intrigue et amour	154	36,087
+Shakespeare: La Mégère apprivoisée	153	43,447
+Mark Twain: Le Mendiant et le prince	148	67,934
+Shakespeare: Hamlet	134	100,376
+Shakespeare: Roméo et Juliette	131	57,492
+Molière: Tartuffe	124	48,581
+Victorien Sardou: Divorçons!	120	34,758
+Henrik Ibsen: Le Maison de poupée	117	26,797
Victor Eftimiu: La Vagabond	115	25,799
Mark Twain: Les Aventures de Tom Sawyer	114	53,371
Léo Tolstoi-Erwin Piscator: La guerre et la paix	113	98,533
Ben Jonson: La Femme silencieuse	107	30,693
+Franz et Paul Schönthan: L'enlèvement des Sabines	107	28,623
+Molière: L'Ecole des femmes	95	30,935
+Shakespeare: Beaucoup de bruit pour rien	94	61,666
+Anton Tchekov: Oncle Vania	81	25,757
+Edmond Rostand: Cyrano de Bergerac	78	73,986
+Shakespeare: Antonius et Cléopâtre	77	81,070
+Shakespeare: Tout est bien qui finit bien	77	31,999
+Shakespeare: Othello	69	43,030
+Bernard Shaw: Le Commandant Barbara	68	31,701
+Maurice Maeterlinck: L'Oiseau Bleu	68	33,262
+Shakespeare: Le Songe d'une nuit d'été	67	48,584
+Léo Tolstoi: Anna Karénine	66	17,650
+Beaumarchais: Le Mariage de Figaro	66	14,159
+Friedrich Schiller: Maria Stuart	65	23,354
+Augustin Moreto: Donna Diana	62	37,176
+Molière: Le Bourgeois gentilhomme	61	28,627
+Molière: L'Avare	60	15,113
+Molière: Le Malade imaginaire	59	28,521
+Oscar Wilde: L'Éventail de Lady Windermere	58	21,194
+Heinrich Kleist: La Crûche cassée	57	10,394
+Shakespeare: La Tempête	57	37,412
+Léo Tolstoi: Le Cadavre vivant	56	33,722
+Carlo Goldoni: Mirandolina	55	14,139
Calderon: Le Fantôme espiègle	53	55,605
+Aristophane: Lysistrata	53	57,387
+Bernard Shaw: La profession de Madame Warren	52	14,642
+Sophocle: Oedipe-roi	50	37,600
+Féodor Dostoievski: Crime et Châtiment	50	17,645

PIECES MUSICALES

a) *Nouvelles oeuvres hongroises:*

Pál Abay-Jeno Horváth: Aime moi!	536	147,997
+Mátyás Csizmarek-Béla Csanak: Mariage de raison	456	158,235
Imre Kertész-Jeno Horváth: L'Amour frappe à la porte	356	153,270
Géza Baróti-Pál Zoltán Kézdi: Tout pour maman	308	100,081
Julia Hajdu: Les Comédiens de Füred	242	118,547
Imre Dobozsy-András Viski: Rue Váci	181	57,850
+Egon Kemény: Quelque part dans le Sud	177	47,585
+György Szücs-András Bágya: J'épouse ma femme	173	66,540

	Nombre des représentations	Nombre des spectateurs
Ferenc Farkas: Ecole des gendres	158	50,097
+Mátyás Csizmarek-Béla Csanak: Un type bien situé	146	56,983
Béla Gádor-Szabolcs Fényes-András		
Bágya: Le Chevalier des rêves	118	59,482
György Ránki: Série bleue	114	92,587
+Lajos Lajtai: Trois printemps	106	123,744
Imre Kertész-Szabolcs Fényes: Equipage à ânon	105	23,956
+Mihály Eisemann: 77. Allée du Bastion	90	27,650
Imre Kertész-Julia Hajdu: Mademoiselle la doctoresse	87	33,118
+István Sárközy: Les Femmes de Szelistye	82	73,378
+Jenő Horváth: Valse de printemps	79	15,351
Miklós Rónai-Erno Vécsey: Tout au plus nous divorçons	77	28,478
György Szücs-Erno Vécsey: La Femme gagne davantage	62	21,275
Géza Baróti-Tamás Garai: Oh, c'est maman!	62	20,421
János Gyulai-Károly Aszlányi: Les sept gifles	59	41,391
Attila Biró: Musique en mai	58	15,533
György Ránki-Miklós Hubay: Les Trois nuits d'un amour	55	38,668
Tibor Polgár-Mór Jókai: Ces pauvres riches	54	31,041
Amadé Németh: Colonel Simonyi	53	19,442
Ferenc Felkai-Erno Vécsey: Je vous connais bien	52	13,941
Otto Vincze: Aventure à Buda	50	52,618
József Ságodi-Kálmán Fülöp: Voyons la nouvelle génération!	50	15,415

b) *Anciennes oeuvres hongroises:*

+Viktor Jakobi: Marché aux filles	613	381,730
+Imre Kálmán: La Reine du tchardas	282	195,366
+Pál Abrahám: Bal au Savoy	252	117,247
+Imre Kálmán: La Princesse du cirque	251	120,112
+Ferenc Lehár: Le Comte de Luxembourg	250	113,447
+Ferenc Lehár: Clerc voyageur	207	58,436
+Viktor Jacobi: Sybill	207	107,362
+Ferenc Lehár: La Veuve joyeuse	134	73,632
+Pongrácz Kacsóh: Jean le Preux	124	157,490
+Imre Kálmán: La Violette de Montmartre	102	25,143
+Géza Gárdonyi-Károly De Fries: Le Roman d'Ida	77	29,377
+Gergely Csiky-Rezso Máder: La Grand'maman	77	27,529
+Imre Kálmán: La Comtesse Marica	75	46,316
+Imre Kálmán: La Bayadère	69	30,093
+Imre Kálmán: Le Violoniste tzigane	55	25,119
+Imre Kálmán: Le Cavalier diabolique	54	25,227

c) *Oeuvres étrangères modernes:*

+Isaac Dounaievski: Acacias Blancs	311	99,809
+Youri Milioutine: Le Baiser de Juanita	283	80,497
Paul Burkhard: Feu d'artifice	264	
Leo Lenz-Peter Hansen: Un mari d'occasion	220	59,894
+Vladimir Dikhovitehnik-Nikita Bogouslavski: Voyage de nocces	132	30,935
Pietro Garinei-Gorni Kramer: Un dimanche à Rome	105	74,409
Nikita Bogouslavski: Mieux que chez nous	72	24,981
+Isaac Dounaievski: Un vent libre	63	26,180
Korostilev-Lvovski: Le Chapeau magique	60	31,821
Youri Milioutine: Bonheur inquiet	58	42,486

d) *Oeuvres étrangères anciennes:*

	Nombre des représentations	Nombre des spectateurs
+Hervé: Mam'zelle Nitouche	448	161,811
+Johann Strauss: Le Baron tzigane	200	124,071
+Franz Suppé: Boccace	177	177,040
+Johann Strauss: La Chauve-souris	144	85,017
+Franz Schubert: Trois jeunes filles	123	79,284
+Karl Millöcker: Le Clerc mendiant	116	87,651
+Jacques Offenbach: La Belle Hélène	112	123,751
+Leo Fall: Madame Pompadour	78	27,299
+Robert Katscher: Valse à la chandelle	52	8,146

e) *Opéras et ballets:*

+Ferenc Erkel: Le Ban Bánk	108	131,977
+Giacomo Puccini: Madame Butterfly	106	113,132
+Zoltán Kodály: János Háy	100	78,083
+Giuseppe Verdi: La Traviata	93	83,584
+Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart: L'Enlèvement au Sérail	91	70,046
+Giuseppe Verdi: Rigoletto	82	81,315
+Charles Gounod: Faust	76	108,051
+Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart: La Flûte enchantée	70	83,454
+Giacomo Puccini: Tosca	59	68,139
+Georges Bizet: Carmen	57	76,778
+Peter Tchaikovski: Casse-noisette	57	73,829
+Giacomo Puccini: La Bohème	56	64,141
+Giacomo Puccini: Manon Lescaut	53	62,722
+Giuseppe Verdi: Othello	50	56,011
+Giuseppe Verdi: Il Trovatore	50	67,007

PIECES POUR MARIONNETTES

+Dezso Szilágyi: La Flûte d'argent	364	104,567
Léo Tolstoi-Zoltán Jékely: Les Aventures d'un nigaud	340	102,112
+Grimm-Dezso Szilágyi: Jeannot et Juliette (Hänsel und Gretchen)	313	95,167
+Polivanova: Oursons espiègles	230	72,285
+Ferenc Móra: Relli Pápai: Csalavári Csalavér	219	68,551
Miklós Mészöly-Ilona Molnár: Le prince Argylus	195	54,507
Grimm-Rózsa Ignác: La Belle-au-bois-dormant	155	49,947
N. Gernet-Anna Bárd: La Lampe magique d'Aladdine	123	37,267
Eszter Tóth: Les Trois petits cochons	110	32,623
Grimm-Amy Károlyi: Blanche-Neige	110	30,181
György G. Dénes-György Kardos-Dezso Király-Péter Tardos: Réussite sûre	93	21,663
Hans Christian Andersen-György Kardos: La Nouvelle tenue de l'empereur	84	25,565
Jeno J. Tersánszky-György Kardos: Les Pérégrinations de Michou, l'écureuil	83	25,615
Sándor Török-Eszter Tóth: Les Merveilles de Csili-Csala	66	20,849
Youri Spéranski-Zoltán Jékely: La Belle des belles	62	19,497

**GROUP III
Conference
Report**

BROOKS MCNAMARA
Developing and Improving Artistic Leadership

The Panel:

EARLE GISTER, U.S.A., Chairman

JOEL ADEDIJI, Nigeria

E. ALKAZI, India

LEE BELTZER, U.S.A.

REYNALDO D'AMORE, Peru

JEAN DARCANTE, France

RANDOLPH EDMONDS, U.S.A.

ARVI KIVIMAA, Finland

ROBERT LOPER, U.S.A.

ERICH SCHUMACHER, West Germany

HANS ULLBERG, Sweden

IN THE INITIAL SESSION OF THE DISCUSSION GROUP THE CHAIRMAN CHARGED THE delegates with the responsibility of preparing individual statements based on the delegates' personal experience with reference to the discovery the development, the responsibilities and the problems of the artistic leader.

Mr. Gister of the United States spoke about the restrictions of artistic leadership in American regional theatre activities. Of a regional theatre with which he is familiar, Mr. Gister said:

The Board is composed of local businessmen. They are not professionals in the theatre. Although they are interested in the theatre, their primary interests is in the budget sheet. They often equate artistic quality, with profit and loss.

He felt that similar problems were being faced by many regional theatres in this country and that undue limitations were thus placed on the creative activities of the artistic director.

Mr. Adedeji of Nigeria indicated that the development of artistic leadership in his country was a prime consideration of Nigeria's educational theatre program. He pointed out, however, that very few professional theatres exist because of limited financial resources and the lack of government subsidy. Thus it is difficult for the graduates of his university to obtain jobs. The potential for leadership by his school, therefore, often goes unused.

The statement by Mr. Alkazi of India defined the responsibility of Indian artistic leadership in relation to the life of the Indian people. Schools of drama, Mr. Alkazi said, must be constantly in touch with the mainstream of artistic thought and with the inner life of the common people. The theatre teacher in order to lead must be a visionary and a creative artist. In his opinion, the most important function of the teacher is to initiate within his student a creative impulse and then withdraw.

Mr. Darcante noted that in France there are six categories of theatrical operation and that the amount of state subsidy varies widely. The six categories are:

- (1) Private theatres.
- (2) National theatres.
- (3) The Parisian equivalent of the American Off-Broadway theatre.
- (4) Provincial theatres.
- (5) Dramatic Centers.
- (6) House of Culture.

All of these theatres receive state subsidy. Private theatres receive only a small amount of money from the state. Certain national theatres, however, receive considerable state support. Mr. Darcante described the Houses of Culture that are recent additions to the French theatrical scene. The Houses of Culture are designed as places where young and old of all social classes may meet, converse and interact. The heart of a House of Culture is its theatre. Exhibitions, lectures, and performances of plays are coordinated. Newsletters are published by the House of Culture in order to distribute information and engender interest in the arts. Speaking specifically of the French Houses of Culture, Mr. Darcante said that basic problems had arisen over the choice of directors of these institutions. The French government, he indicated, favored individuals from the world of the theatre while the municipalities tended to favor professional administrators. Mr. Darcante believes that those Houses of Culture led by professional theatre people do the best work. The problem faced by these directors, however, is to harmonize the divergent tastes of the community, because performances are attended by workers, students, and members of the middle class.

Mr. Ullberg reported that in Sweden all the arts are financially supported by the government. The heads of the subsidized theatres in Sweden are nominated by three groups:

- (1) The government.
- (2) Local government.
- (3) Theatre boards which have representatives from both the state and local authorities.

The individual in charge of a theatre is given a three to five year contract and is the sole liaison between the government and his theatre. He selects individual directors and each director is responsible for the final results of the production. Consulting artistic committees have been established and the head of the theatre often discusses with them questions concerning his repertory. These committees are made up of his fellow artists. The theatres assume a teaching responsibility by sending their actors to schools to perform plays and discuss the plays with the students. The theatres in Sweden submit their budgets on a yearly basis, but make their overall financial plans on a five year basis.

Mr. Kivimaa of Finland indicated that the government's relationship to the theatre in his nation was fundamentally similar to the systems of Sweden and France. All professional theatres (31 Finnish and 4 Swedish) are subsidized by the state. Those in charge of individual theatres are given contracts for a minimum of three years. Mr. Kivimaa described an interesting system of training directors in use in his country. The program emphasizes international aspects

of the theatre through the use of visiting foreign professors. As in Sweden the theatres in Finland assume a responsibility to the youth of the nation by performing for them each year plays from the regular repertory at reduced admission. While the literary tradition of Finland has been mainly epic, more writers are now turning their attention to theatre and are developing personal dramatic styles. Mr. Kivimaa made the important point that artistic leaders must be sensitive to the changes occurring in the arts. He emphasized that too often old techniques are used when dealing with new forms of dramatic literature. He reported with satisfaction the emergence of experimental theatres devoted to exploring new production techniques. Another point of interest made by Mr. Kivimaa concerned the two categories of Workers' Theatres in Finland. The first is created by the workers themselves and makes use of visiting professional talent. The second is organized by professional theatre people for the benefit of the workers. Either may develop into a municipal, subsidized theatre if the quality of the work warrants it.

Mr. Moreno of Venezuela reported that limited resources made work in the professional theatre in his country difficult. Most of the theatrical activity was of an amateur nature. Leadership and assistance is being provided by universities and by the initiative of individuals. The development of theatre in Venezuela is in the hands of the National Institute of the Theatre. In February, the Institute held its third national festival, which attempts to focus attention on the theatrical activity of the country. At this most recent festival, fourteen theatrical groups presented as many plays. The center of theater in Venezuela is in Caracas where six theatres are operating. None of these six operates on a permanent basis. Each year there are two playwriting competitions to stimulate the development of new playwrights. One competition is under the auspices of the National Institute and the other is under private auspices. There is also a center at the university in Caracas for the investigation and development of the theatre. The center also publishes plays.

The problem of leadership in the American college and university theatre supported by public funds was discussed by Mr. Beltzer of the United States. Mr. Beltzer indicated that his school (Brooklyn College, N. Y.), like many American colleges, did not place emphasis upon the training of professional theatre practitioners. He said that even though there is a director of theatre studies at Brooklyn College, artistic decisions rested primarily in the hands of each individual directing a play during the academic year.

Mr. Edmonds of the United States felt strongly that the artistic leader is born and not made, and that the improvement, but not the creation of the leader is possible through training and experience. He believed that the primary responsibility of the person in a position of artistic leadership is to his art. Mr. Edmonds emphasized especially the difficulties of leadership in the Negro theatre in America. The central problem for the Negro artistic leader, he felt, was that a Negro tradition and a Negro audience were only now emerging in the United States. Mr. Alkazi, replying to comments by Mr. Edmonds, suggested that the American Negro should develop his own theatrical form without reference to the generally received traditions of dramatic art. Mr. Edmonds replied, that in his opinion the Negro as an American must fully experience and relate to the

mainstream of theatre in this country. A basic problem is to make the theatre more accessible to the Negro, both as participant and as spectator.

One of the most interesting points of discussion came as a result of Mr. Edmond's remark that those in position of artistic leadership must act as their own censors. The idea of censorship aroused deep concern on the part of many members of the committee. Mr. Darcante, Mr. Alkazi, and many others spoke out against censorship of any kind. In point of fact, the surest way for the theatre to decline was to impose on it a rigid moral standard. Mr. Kivimaa declared that the theatre must be free to show all sides of Man. Mr. Edmonds clarified his position by saying that his intent had been to characterize the artistic leader as one who must uphold artistic standards rather than any particular moral standard.

Mr. D'Amore of Peru indicated that a lack of funds prohibited theatre companies in his nation from operating fully effective training programs. He pointed out, however, that some university theatre activity is now developing, often aided by state grants, and that attempts are being made to develop the Peruvian audience. Mr. D'Amore distributed the pamphlet *Teatre Peruano* to the committee. This pamphlet fully describes the theatrical scene in Peru. It is available through the Peruvian ITI Center in Lima, Peru. Mr. D'Amore also described an experimental theatre movement in his country which is a reaction against the commercial theatre. The aim of the experimental theatre is to reach a professional level of production.

The structure of the German theatre was discussed by Mr. Schumacher. The artistic director of a state supported German theatre, he said, is engaged either by a city or a district for four or five years. A tenure of less than four years, Mr. Schumacher felt, would hamper the work of any artistic director in his country by making it difficult for him to realize his goals and to solve the problems of his theatre. By and large, the German artistic director is allowed wide latitude in making artistic decisions. Frequently his contract guarantees his freedom from undue outside pressure. Although solely responsible, the director or head of the theatre is advised by his co-workers. His advisors are the *dramaturg*, the *regisseur* (who may be permanent or visiting), the technical staff, and the chief administrator. The head of the theatre selects his season in consultation with the *dramaturg*. In Germany *dramaturgs* have come to the theatre from literary fields, theatre journalism or from theatre institutes at the university level. At times *dramaturgs* have developed into directors.

The directors in Germany are hired on the basis of their ability to attract a group of highly qualified coworkers, of their creative ability, and of the concern they have shown for the public as well as the entire welfare of the theatre.

All theatres in Germany receive grants from the government. Theatres that also produce operas receive as much as 80% of their total budget. Most theatres, however, operate with a grant of 40% to 60% of their total budget. All income remains with the theatre. Mr. Schumacher gave as an example his own theatre in Essen which receives a grant of nine and one-half million DM per year, and has an income of about two million DM per year.

The Polish delegate, Mr. Korzeniewski, said that the problem of artistic leadership begins at the student level. First, it must be determined whether the student has the personal characteristics to become a director. Second, he must receive a good education. Finally, he must be provided with good conditions in which to

perform his work. To help the young there are three schools in Poland. In order to enter a school as a director, the individual must direct a play. The general education of the director is linked with practical work. The students must direct two plays. The first is produced during his third year under workshop conditions. At this time the professional theatres attempt to attract the most highly qualified students to move away from the school. Students without the diploma, however, have difficulty in obtaining positions with the professional theatres, and consequently most remain for the fourth year when they must direct their second production. The second production required for the diploma is directed without faculty control or supervision. Included in the four year program are assignments to theatres where students work in a variety of capacities. A commission evaluates his work with the professional theatre.

There are seventy repertory companies in Poland. All receive financial grants. Three of the companies receive grants from the state and the rest receive grants from municipalities. The national plan for subsidy requires that theatres in large cities must operate at 90% of capacity. The requirement for theatres in smaller cities is between 60% and 80% of capacity.

In addition to the professional theatre, there are theatres within the university, operated by students. Individuals who have worked in the university theatres for five years may enter the professional theatre if the national commission decides that they are qualified to do so.

When asked to clarify the qualities of a good director, Mr. Korzeniewski listed the following characteristics:

- (1) He should be a cultured, intelligent individual.
- (2) He must possess vision and a plastic, dynamic imagination.
- (3) He must not only be able to think abstractly, but have the ability to think as a primitive.
- (4) He must know what an actor can give.
- (5) He must know what is happening in the world today in order to keep from falling into the past.

In conclusion, Mr. Korzeniewski felt that the director must be mature and suggested that an individual must be approximately 27 years old before he can assume the responsibilities of directorship.

Following the first phase of the discussion, the chairman noted reluctance on the part of some of the members of the committee to describe the essential qualities of artistic leadership, as if delineating these qualities would suggest that one could guarantee leadership through the creation of a formula that would provide a mechanical solution to a human problem. However, the chairman felt that certain qualities had been mentioned often enough in discussion to deserve special attention. There appears to be general agreement on the following characteristics of artistic leadership:

- (1) He has the ability to animate and stimulate creativity in others.
- (2) He has a vision and makes us see our art in fresh ways.
- (3) He is sensitive to changes in the arts.
- (4) He has an obligation to his art to see that it is sustained by providing opportunity for experimentation and the development of new talent.

There was general agreement that, in the final analysis, artistic leadership can only be judged by the quality of the individual's work.

Rather than attempt to describe qualities of artistic leadership, the group considered it more important to describe some of the conditions that might permit such leadership to develop and thrive. Discussion began with the training situation as the first opportunity for developing artistic leadership.

It was agreed that training for the professional theatre must be limited to those who have the qualities necessary for careers in the theatre. So far as the training itself is concerned, Mr. Korzeniewski said that students need to be trained for the future, for what does not now exist. Teachers should attempt to develop a sense in the student that he must fight for his ideas. It is important, therefore, that training situations provide ample opportunities for experimentation. Finally, the training situation should have a direct relation to working situations in the theatre so that the student has access to professional experience and opportunities.

In the working situation, conditions should be such that there is freedom to fail. This does not imply a condition that would permit irresponsibility, but it does require a degree of contractual stability that would allow experimentation and the development of new techniques. Also, individuals in positions of artistic leadership must have the opportunity and freedom to travel, to broaden their experiences, and to exchange ideas with people from other theatres and other countries.

Discussion of other desirable conditions for promoting and encouraging artistic leadership dealt with the relation of the artistic director to his fellow workers. What, for example, should be the relationship of the artistic director to the individual who is in an administrative position in the theatre. Mr. Edmonds suggested that the administrative director should be hired by the artistic director to ensure the most effective relationship between these two. It was recognized by all that the artistic director needs to have relief from an excessive amount of concern over administrative details. Although his work is constantly concerned with financial questions, he must be able to devote himself primarily to the realization of his artistic goals. Evidence presented by various members of the committee indicated that highly qualified administrators had come to the theatre from diverse backgrounds. Training situations similar to the Ford Foundation theatre management internship program do not seem to exist in other countries. It is too early to determine, however, whether or not the Ford Foundation project has been able to accomplish its purpose of developing theatre personnel for administrative positions. It could not be said, therefore, that a discernible pattern has evolved in the training and improvement of administrative personnel who are in a position to influence artistic leadership.

On this point, examples were given of individuals who had assumed the responsibilities for both artistic and administrative activities. In all cases discussed it was agreed that although the individual may have been highly competent in both areas of work, eventually his creative energies were sapped by the demands of financial and administrative matters.

Assistance to the artistic director can also come from his relationship to a

dramaturg. Mr. Darcante offered the following description of how the *dramaturg* contributes to the identification and realization of artistic goals:

The *dramaturg* is one who acts as the literary adviser by reading plays and serves as the historical researcher for the director-creator. The significance of this contribution to the individual in a position of artistic leadership was recognized in Poland by the establishment of a training program for *dramaturgs*. Mr. Korzeniewski reported, however, that the program had to be discontinued after four years of operation because directors did not wish to use the young men prepared by this process. Mr. Schumacher, on the other hand, said that in Germany, the *dramaturg* was a strong and courageous force for experimentation in the theatre. When conditions permit, the *dramaturg* can perform a valuable service, just as any other fellow artist can interact with and stimulate the person responsible for the artistic policy of the theatre.

Finally, the committee turned to a consideration of the playwright as a person in a position of artistic leadership. Three current means exist for establishing conditions which encourage new playwrights. Mr. D'Amore identified these as

- (1) Playwriting courses in colleges and universities.
- (2) Playwriting competitions.
- (3) The production of new plays by professional companies for the sake of the playwright, rather than with profit as a primary motive.

There was some disagreement among the delegates from the United States as to the value of playwriting courses. For example, the chairman suggested that without workshop situations, where the play has the possibility of coming to life, playwriting courses have little connection with the practical situation of theatre. The committee acknowledged that, regrettably, playwriting competitions do not contribute significantly to the discovery of new playwriting talents. The conclusion was that the most desirable condition for promoting and encouraging playwrights is to make it possible for their plays to be produced under professional circumstances.

The committee returned repeatedly to the point that financial assistance in the form of subsidy or grants is absolutely essential to establish the proper conditions under which artistic leaders can be developed or improved in either training or working conditions.

Postscript

The Peruvian Theatrical Movement

by REYNALDO D'AMORE

"The Peruvian theatrical movement is centered in the theatre known as '*Independent*' or '*Experimental*.' This form of theatre has been enormously effective in Latin America ever since 1930 and was first established in Argentina as a reaction against the professional or commercial theatre. Its main concern as an experimental theatrical movement has been to raise the level of the artistic

repertory theatres and to improve the training of actors and the quality of the mountings of theatrical works.

"Today the Peruvian theatre, centered in Lima, the capital with two million inhabitants, has as its principle base these experimental and independent theatre groups. It is important not to confuse these groups with university theatres in the United States. Aside from these groups there exist some professional companies in their formative stages and the Department of National Theatre (whose budget is so small that it precludes any real efficacy).

Another of the problems which impair the development of a National Theatre and the training of its artistic leaders is the paucity of theatre buildings that function exclusively as such. The government does not have an official policy with regard to the theatre. The national budget is approved in the congress but its recommendations are not always followed or carried out by the executive. National aid is distributed in two fundamental parts; one, which is dedicated to the Department of National Theatre (which has no company) and the National School of Dramatic Art. The second part of the budget is dedicated to the support of the independent groups and certain university groups of quality. This grant was increased year by year and spread out among other groups which were then forming. Until now theatres received a fairly large grant but one which is distributed widely and without any specific criterion as to the work of the organization. Nevertheless, the theatre life of Lima has grown obviously during recent years. This was most tangibly noticed in the ever larger numbers of interested public.

**GROUP IV
Conference
Report**

O. G. BROCKETT
Theatre in the Education Process

The Panel:

HORACE ROBINSON, *U.S.A., Chairman*

RADU BELIGAN, *Romania*

OKOT P'BITEK, *Uganda*

WILLIAM CLEVELAND, *U.S.A.*

MEHDI FOROUGH, *Iran*

CECILE GUIDOTE, *The Philippines*

RYOICHI NAKAGAWA, *Japan*

HANS MICHAEL RICHTER, *East Germany*

VERA MOWRY ROBERTS, *U.S.A.*

GERALDINE SIKS, *U.S.A.*

H. D. SUGATHAPALA, *Ceylon*

HENRY B. WILLIAMS, *U.S.A.*

IN HYUNG YOO, *Korea*

THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE DISCUSSION OF "THEATRE IN THE EDUCATION PROCESS" came from nine nations and four continents. This diversity was compounded by vast differences in social, political, and cultural backgrounds. Surprisingly, however, the delegates disagreed little about educational and cultural goals. If the participants held sharply opposing views on the questions raised, they did not express them in significantly controversial discussion. Consequently, the following report focuses upon the major topics considered and the conclusions reached.

The discussions revolved around four levels of education: primary, secondary, college or university, and continuing education. Some, notably the primary and adult levels, were discussed more systematically or extensively than others. The major theme of all the exchanges was the need to cultivate high artistic standards and humanistic ideals. While all delegates agreed that the theatre should contribute to educational goals, they were even more concerned that it be treated as an art valuable in its own right, rather than as a tool for teaching moral lessons, illustrating social studies, or conveying factual information. Above all, they expressed their desire to foster in students a lasting appreciation of the theatre and the need to create a drama which will attract adults after they have left the schoolroom behind.

Much information was exchanged about theatrical and educational conditions in the nine countries represented by the panel. This material has been summarized in appendices.

If we begin with the assumption that education should enlarge experience, sharpen perception, and increase knowledge, it follows that the theatre may be

used as an educational tool. In fact, the educational potentialities of the theatre are so vast that they are not yet fully understood or envisioned. They cannot be entirely encompassed within a program of instruction, however, for learning is a continuous process which does not end merely because formal study has been completed. While classroom work should have immediate reality for children, it should also prepare them to cope with life more intelligently when they leave the relatively controlled situation of the school and move into the world where they must relate their learning to new circumstances.

These assumptions raise fundamental questions about the goals of theatre used as an educational tool. Obviously it is easier to formulate general aims than to enumerate a multitude of particular benefits. Thus, the members of the panel agreed that the development of concentration, discipline, and imagination should be important goals in the training of all children and that dramatic activity provides one effective means for achieving them. Furthermore, they agreed that the theatre may help children evaluate situations and create new realities. Above all, they affirmed their belief that, because it utilizes all of the arts, the theatre offers a special opportunity for developing artistic sensitivity in children. Through it, the child may become aware of rhythm, melody, movement, line, texture, color, and language; he may learn how each is expressive alone or in combination with the others. Along with sensitivity come discrimination and judgment, equally desirable faculties. For these reasons, the panel strongly recommended dramatic activity as an educational tool for expanding perceptions and feelings and urged that it be accorded a status in the curriculum comparable to that now given the visual arts and music.

On the other hand, dramatic activity in the schools is not without danger, for the insensitive or inexperienced teacher may discourage rather than foster artistic abilities. The panel questioned the oft-made assumption that, because young children are not always overtly discriminating in their judgments, it is acceptable to give them theatrical experiences which adults would reject as artistically inadequate. Unless artistic sensitivity is fostered at an early age, it may not appear later. Therefore, high artistic standards should be maintained in educational theatre, not only in order to encourage the child's personal development, but as a means of creating a discriminating public for the arts.

Although educators have long recognized the value of creative dramatics in teaching young children, they have given much less attention to theatrical activities for students between the ages of 14 and 18. While productions have been allowed at this level, little care has been taken to see that they foster artistic discrimination. Frequently plays are produced merely to raise money for school projects or to keep students occupied. Often the plays are without merit and the directors untrained. Under these circumstances, educational goals are ignored and artistic discrimination discouraged. While awareness of this crucial problem is growing, more rapid progress toward higher standards is urgently needed.

When the student reaches the university, he may encounter still fewer theatrical activities within his program of study. A marked exception to this rule is found in the United States, and theatrical activities within universities are increasing in many other countries. At this level, theatre education may be divided roughly

in terms of two goals: education for a career which will require theatrical skills; and education which creates more discriminating audiences.

Since the training of theatrical personnel was discussed by another group, it was ignored by this panel for the most part. Nevertheless, the participants expressed concern about the adequacy of teachers who utilize theatrical skills, and strongly recommended that persons with professional competency be sought to teach whenever possible, even though they may not have had the typical training in liberal arts. Some delegates expressed distress at the apparent lack of cooperation between the educational and professional theatre in the United States. Although this problem is not unique to the United States, it is less acute in other countries, especially in those emerging nations in which the educational theatre has laid the foundation upon which the professional theatre is being built. While the barriers between the educational and professional theatre in America are no longer so strong as in the past, greater cooperation between them is still needed.

The desire to have more discriminating adult audiences raises many issues about the effectiveness of early education. When the student is freed from a teacher's guidance, does he continue to seek theatrical experience? If so, of what kind? Is there a gap between the stated aims of education and the results as reflected in audiences? These are not questions which can be answered easily, for in many countries no theatrical activity is readily available and this inaccessibility blunts the goals of theatre education. Nevertheless, a number of delegates expressed dismay at the apparent disparity between the goals of the American educational theatre, the most extensive in the world, and the average cultural level represented by the majority of theatrical and television productions now available to the public.

The current situation raises the question of the government's relationship to the arts. The members of the panel expressed their belief that governments (which do not hesitate to assume authority over educational aims and standards) cannot abdicate their responsibilities for cultural activities within and beyond the school level. Many delegates felt strongly that each government should make the cultural heritage of the nation available to all of its people. On the other hand, all members of the panel agreed that governments should not control what audiences are allowed to see. The dominance of the theatre by businessmen has not proven a satisfactory substitute, however, for here too control of the theatre has been taken from trained theatrical workers. The need to make a profit has been a major cause in reducing the theatre to its current position as an art serving less than five percent of the population.

If the mass media are included as theatrical activities, the percentage of spectators rises rapidly. Their inclusion, however, does not reduce the problem, since in America today they too are operated as commercial ventures whose repertory is chosen on the basis of its potentiality for selling various products. Furthermore, the accessibility of television has tended to undermine the live theatre and, since it often caters to the lowest level of taste, to subvert artistic discrimination. The attractiveness of television does not reside merely in its availability, however, and if it is to be used more effectively for artistic purposes, reforms will be required. Before significant reforms are possible, however, new

attitudes about the role of government in cultural affairs and about the public responsibility or mass media must be aroused, a task which leads back once more to education. Here the role of the critic may also become crucial, for he should be especially concerned with serving that public which is no longer undergoing formal education. Because of the critic's potentiality for influencing attitudes, more care should be taken to insure that he understands both the theatre and the community which he serves.

Fortunately, the American experience with the theatre and mass media is not necessarily typical. In many countries a Ministry of Culture fosters the arts and provides both financial support and artistic advice. Furthermore, in many of the emerging nations the theatre and mass media cooperate in reaching common ends; the mass media are operated by personnel trained in the theatre schools and in turn the mass media create a demand for live theatrical performances. This cooperation seems commendable and offers a model which might be emulated elsewhere.

Many of the topics already discussed bear upon repertory, but two additional points need to be made. It is often assumed that the "classics" should form the basis of any well-balanced repertory and will be the best means of introducing young people to the theatre. While this may be true, the assumption should not be accepted too quickly. Both adults and children must be led from the known to the unknown, and poorly performed classics or unfamiliar production styles may discourage rather than attract spectators. To attract, works must meet contemporary needs rather than becoming more museum pieces. Furthermore, the theatre, if it is to create that sense of fulfillment which will make audiences turn to it as a source of lasting pleasure, must offer its spectators productions which are not only entertaining but which celebrate human values and arouse a sense of communion among men.

Finally, the panel affirmed its faith in the theatre as an instrument for international understanding. Not only should theatre be available to all peoples of the world, but theatrical productions and plays should be exchanged among nations. This view in no sense envisions the obliteration of national differences in art, for a work must be "national in form to be international in substance." As the theatre arouses mutual appreciation perhaps understanding will follow in other fields as well.

Postscript*

Theatre Education in Japan

by RYOICHI NAKAGAWA

Japan is proud of its older drama, such as Noh and Kabuki, but it is now searching for new forms more meaningful to the present. Only about five percent of the Japanese attend the traditional theatre, and the younger generation

*The *Postscripts* to this section of the Report are in the form of précis statements made during the discussion. They have been prepared by the group's secretary, Mr. O. G. Brockett, and do not represent actual quotation.

especially have turned toward more realistic modes of expression. Although Kabuki plays are performed in the commercial theatres, Noh and Bunraku Puppet plays are performed in their own special theatres. Most of the national subsidy to the theatre is used to preserve these national treasures. Western classics are performed by actors trained for the modern drama, rather than by Kabuki or Noh actors. The so-called Shin-geki (or New Theatre) presents plays not only by Ibsen, Shaw, O'Neill, Miller, Albee, Beckett and Ionesco, but also those by Sophocles, Shakespeare, Molière and Goethe. Since Japan had a bitter experience before 1945 with patriotic and chauvinistic plays, propaganda drama is now discouraged.

Training for the theatre is limited, although there are special training programs for actors of Noh and Kabuki. Only three universities or colleges have independent drama departments; their graduates have difficulty in obtaining jobs, for they are not often employed in the commercial theatre and there is no extensive educational theatre activity. As in America, commercial producers do not necessarily expect actors to have had systematic training or an academic background.

Only limited training in creative dramatics is available to teachers. The artistic level of the theatrical activities in the public schools varies widely. Several adult professional troupes perform for children, and children are sometimes taken to Noh and Kabuki plays so that they may learn to appreciate the national classics. Although the children do not understand the classical Japanese language used in these forms, the elaborate style of presentation fascinates them. The so-called government-subsidized television stations have a second channel for educational and cultural programs. On these, there is at least one dramatic program each week for children and another for adult viewers.

Postscript

Theatre Education in the German Democratic Republic (East Germany)

by HANS MICHAEL RICHTER

In Germany most persons attend some cultural activity: art exhibits, concerts, theatrical performance. There are 70 professional theatres in the German Democratic Republic, a country of about 17,500,000 inhabitants. Although the theatre is not controlled by the government proper, there is much concern that the theatre be sensitive to the needs of all the people. The repertory is discussed with: (1) the board of managing directors, (2) the board of artistic directors, (3) with each company in terms of box office potentialities, public demand, and critical response, (4) with various public groups, most notably the "spectator councils" which are representative of all trades and professions, and (5) the town

council. Ultimately, the general manager and the *dramaturg* of the theatre must choose the plays. The town councils (in some cases, the federal government) subsidize the theatres, but they do not dictate repertory, casting, etc. While they are sometimes in a position to question decisions, they have never vetoed the theatre's choices. In arranging a repertory, there must be a balance between substance and box office appeal. In Leipzig, about 50% of the theatre's expenses are met by subsidies; elsewhere, about 70% is more typical. Without this support, the quality of costumes and settings would suffer. The public is lively and expresses its approval by giving many curtain calls and its disapproval by staying away from the theatre.

Aesthetic education is offered in every school, but the direction which it will take depends much upon the individual teacher. Thus the emphasis placed upon the theatre varies widely. The first German children's theatre, "Theatre of the Young World," was founded in Leipzig in 1945. The need for children's theatres is now recognized throughout the Republic, and an association of children's theatres has evolved. Plays presented to children are arranged into three groups according to the age of the children: 5-8, 9-11, 12-14. In Leipzig, about 65,000 children have season tickets to five or six professional productions annually. Actors also go to the schools, where they read poems or scenes from plays and talk about the theatre. Children who are interested in performing or working with plays have the opportunity to do so in programs connected with the professional theatre. Children volunteer for this experience and work under professional guidance in productions intended for other children. Insufficient provisions have been made for the age group 14-18. To remedy the situation, Youth Theatre Clubs are being formed to discuss and attend plays. Young people are also beginning to perform plays under their own initiative. No methodic pattern yet exists.

In the universities, theatre clubs are numerous but few produce plays. Most theatre education at the higher level is offered in three specialized schools: the Theatrical High School in Leipzig, the Theatrical School in Berlin, and the High School of Motion Picture Arts. Entrance is gained through audition and on the basis of previous academic records. A student pays tuition only if his parents have an income of more than 2000 marks monthly. The course for actors continues for four years, of which two are spent in classroom training and two in studio work. In the Republic there are also two Departments of "Theatre Science" for the training of dramaturgs, directors, critics, and theatre historians. This course extends over five years. A post-graduate institution is now being formed to study theatrical problems.

Recently programs have been initiated to assist established artists. Under them, teachers from universities or specialists in various fields lecture to theatrical personnel. Furthermore, because some workers, notably dancers, have short professional careers, programs are offered under which they may develop a second profession, often within the theatre. Each theatre has funds which may be used to assist theatre workers who wish to obtain additional training.

Postscript*Theatre Education in Iran*by MEHDI FOROUGH

About 40 years ago the government decided that creative activities were desirable and took charge of cultural affairs. At that time, large auditoriums were built, but no theatre was developed in them. About 20 years ago, a school of dramatic art was initiated. The professional theatre has grown out of the educational system and has been created by an educated group.

Although Iranian drama is about 200 years old, it was primarily religious until the 20th Century. Many of the religious plays are still performed in remote provinces. Story-telling also plays a large part in Iranian life, and the long literary tradition of Iran has been transmitted even to the peasants who are familiar with much lyric poetry. This literary and folk tradition has provided the basis for the modern Iranian drama. During the past 10 years, Greek, Roman, and other western drama both historical and contemporary, has been translated and produced.

Training of theatrical personnel is given in a special school. Here the quality of the productions is higher than that seen in the professional theatres and sets a standard for the entire country. The school also trains workers for the mass media, which cooperate closely with the theatre. The interest aroused through television, radio, and movies has created a demand for live theatre, and the same performers appear in all media. There have been three theatres in Ispahan for about 20 years. There are now three theatres in Teheran, each open for a full season annually.

In the public schools, theatrical activities are introduced in the kindergarten. Most of the teachers have been trained in the West. The plays performed here are usually related to festivals or special events. Most are didactic and make some moral point. Radio also presents many plays for children.

Postscript*Theatre Education in Korea*by IN HYUNG YOO

Theatrical activity in Korea can be traced back to the beginning of the Christian era. The traditional forms fall roughly into two types: mask plays and puppet plays. Modern drama dates only from about 1908 and is not yet fully established. In 1950 a National Theatre, the first in any Asian country, was opened. War hindered its progress, but it has grown since 1961, when it was placed under the Ministry of Public Information and provided with a permanent

building and an increased subsidy. Currently a new home is being built for it within the National Cultural Center.

In 1962 the Korean Drama Center was founded and now operates a special institute, the Seoul Drama School, for the training of theatrical artists. The Center also administers the "Movement to Foster Playwrights," under which prizes are offered for the best new works. A workshop for playwrights is also conducted at the center.

Since 1961 departments of drama have been established in some universities. Each year the Drama Center sponsors a contest for plays produced by high schools, while a similar competition is conducted by the Korean Children's Drama Society and the Ministry of Education.

Postscript

Theatre Education in Ceylon

by H. D. SUGATHAPALA

The Ceylonese government believes that it has an obligation to make cultural activities available to all of the people. Since Western drama appeals only to the 5% who are highly educated and who are English-speaking, a new Singhal drama is slowly being created from folk materials and contemporary themes. Young people are encouraged to express themselves in dramatic form and are given assistance in attaining greater proficiency. In the Drama Festivals conducted by the Drama Panel of the Arts Council, only new plays are allowed. While old forms are drawn upon in creating the new drama, they are not revered for their own sake but prized only to the extent that they are made meaningful to modern audiences.

The College of Fine Arts trains teachers in dance and music, both of which figure prominently in Ceylonese dramatic activities. Drama in the schools is often related to the many annual festivals (Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, etc.). School dramatic activities are divided between primary and secondary levels. Each year a competition is held for plays produced by the schools. About 40 primary schools and 56 secondary schools participate at the regional level. From these the best are chosen for the competition held in Colombo. Here trophies are given for the three best performances, and the ten best are sent on tour into various parts of the country. Through these festivals, about 100 teachers are given help toward improving their work in theatrical production. Since all of the plays are new, encouragement is also given to playwrights. Out of this work in the schools the possibility of a professional theatre is evolving.

The government seeks to bring theatre to all of the people by subsidizing the educational theatre groups and sending them on tour. Because of this practice, admission fees can be kept small to attract low-income groups. All of the activities are planned by the Drama Panel of the Arts Council. The chairmen of the panels which constitute the Arts Council are chosen by the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs. There is no governmental interference in their work.

Postscript

Theatre Education in The Philippines

by CECILE GUIDOTE

The lack of a common language is a major barrier to the development of the theatre in the Philippines. In addition to the 87 dialects of the islands, Spanish and English have also been in common use. Some writers are now trying to combine elements from various sources to arrive at a viable language for all the people.

Theatrical activities have been a part of many folk celebrations such as barrio fiestas and the holidays of saints. Many of the traditional theatrical forms are beginning to die out, and some writers are seeking to rejuvenate them by recasting traditional materials into more contemporary styles, by using new music and similar devices. Authors are also trying to create a drama which will arouse a sense of national identity. Western forms, such as the musical comedy and *zarzuela*, are being adapted to Philippines materials and tastes. Most of the plays given in more formal theatrical surroundings are drawn from the West. By selecting carefully, many which are truly meaningful to Philippine audiences can be found.

Mass media still provide most persons with their only theatrical experiences (in the formal sense). They also provide practically all of the financial support for dramatists and other theatrical personnel. Philippine films are only now becoming technically proficient and a few are of high artistic quality. Conservative moral attitudes among the public place a restriction upon dramatic subject matter and its treatment. Mass media are creating a potential audience for the theatre, one which will hopefully support live performances.

In the past drama has been of little use in the schools. Most of the exceptions have occurred in private schools where creative dramatics have sometimes been introduced on an informal basis. In some schools, there is one public performance annually to which each grade contributes some part. The Philippine Educational Theatre Association sponsors an annual festival of plays from schools. Judges select those to go on to the larger festivals. Entries are not ranked and each is given constructive criticism and encouragement.

In 1967, creative dramatics were introduced as a pilot project of the Philippines Education Association. A qualified teacher of children's theatre and creative dramatics was sent to a southern island to conduct a training program for 35 previously untrained teachers. This work will now be enlarged. Training is divided into two parts, one relating to children from 7 to 9 years old and the other relating to children from 10 to 12 years of age.

Theatre work in colleges and universities is extracurricular. Some activity is encouraged by the language departments. Shortly a "conservatory" training program will be started in an attempt to build a more professional theatre for the Philippines. Classes for teenagers will come first. The program will be sponsored and staffed jointly by a college and university. Courses for teachers will be

given on weekends. Philosophy, history, and theory will be related to the training in an attempt to avoid the schism between the educational and professional theatre which has developed in some other countries.

Postscript

Theatre Education in Uganda
by OKOT p'BITEK

In Uganda, the theatrical form as it is known in the Western world is recent. Traditional dramatic forms, based on folk material and developed in village communities, is a total theatre with drama, music, poetry and dancing undivided.

The National Cultural Centre, subsidized by the government, is an organization founded to promote Ugandan culture. It attempts to develop art forms which are rooted in the lives of the people. It seeks to provide more theatrical facilities and to ensure that the highest standards are attained and maintained. In the capital, the Centre houses drama, music, dance and puppet companies. Its theatre works with Ugandan traditional dramatic forms as well as western. It also operates, in close collaboration with the Department of Drama in the University of Makerere, a school for training actors, musicians, dancers and technical theatre personnel. A travelling theatre from the University Department of Drama takes plays to all parts of the country, performing in markets, school football fields and on street corners.

Schools and amateur drama, music and dance clubs organize an annual festival of the arts on a regional basis. This is not a competition. The staff of the Cultural Centre and writers and actors help to train and direct the performers. They evaluate them and select the best for performances in the Cultural Centre Theatre.

The cultural renaissance that is being witnessed in Uganda is part of a powerful movement sweeping the entire continent of Africa and Asia: a reaction against foreign-imposed culture, a deep search into the soul of men. The question "Who am I?" is being answered in a dynamic style in Uganda through a cultural revolution.

Postscript

*Theatre Education in the United States**
by VERA MOWRY ROBERTS

Historically, there has been an almost absolute dichotomy between theatre in educational institutions and the professional or commercial theatre in the United States. Happily, this dichotomy has become less pronounced in recent years with

*The foreign members of this panel expressed a strong desire to have a statement about the American educational theatre. The following account was written by Mrs. Roberts for this report.

ever-increasing cooperation not only becoming more widespread, but also more sought after by both establishments. Various *modus operandi* have been invented to effect such cooperation: (1) visiting professional artists, such as playwrights, designers, directors, actors, spend varying amounts of time at schools and colleges; (2) producing units, such as APA make their headquarters on a campus; (3) specialists from the institutional theatres are utilized as consultants, directors, etc., by the professional theatre; and (4) the various colleges and universities supply trained artists to the theatre profession. But there is as yet no formal, established, or universally recognized system whereby educational and professional theatre have constant contact and practice mutual help. The proliferation of college and university theatre departments (400 to 500 all over the United States), and the concentration of the professional theatre largely on the East and West Coasts, have meant that it has fallen to the lot of individual establishments to develop their own means of cooperation. But the earlier atmosphere of mutual animosity is now largely dissipated, and the climate for mutual cooperation is now favorable.

Theatre in the educational process in the United States falls naturally into three divisions: children's theatre, teen-theatre, and college and university theatre.

The first of these divides itself again into two equally important parts: creative dramatics and theatre for children. The former, dealing with improvisation in matters of dialogue, rhythm, and movement, is largely applicable to the development of creativity, freedom, and imagination on the part of the young participants, and it requires exceptionally well-trained adult leaders. The latter consists largely in the presentation to child audiences of professionally produced, aesthetically satisfying plays with a variety of subject matters. Such organizations as the Junior Leagues of America, Inc., various parent organizations, schools and civic groups sponsor such performances. The aim of both is to develop in the growing child a deep-felt need for theatre and a joy in participation as erstwhile performers and continuing audience.

Teen-theatre is not only a concern of schools at the secondary level, but also of variously-constituted civic groups, such as settlement houses, community centers, and other social agencies. Here the materials are somewhat more sophisticated, with large use of the standard repertory, and in the best examples, an emphasis upon excellence in production for widespread audiences. Participants from this level of institutional theatre often proceed to professional schools on a higher level, either in colleges or in specialized conservatories.

In by far the largest number of American colleges, the study and practice of theatre stands beside the more traditional academic disciplines as a part of the total liberal arts education. Students may take a "major" in theatre, but the professional goal of most of these majors is not the commercial theatre, but teaching on some level of the educational establishment. Some baccalaureate graduates do, indeed, go directly into the theatre profession, but these are perhaps exceptions rather than the rule. The widespread popularity of theatre work in the undergraduate colleges is a tribute to its status as perhaps the most "liberalizing" of the liberal arts, and to its humanistic and social values. On the other hand, college producing units do very often supply a high order of theatrical

production to large geographic areas which are practically unvisited by professional companies, and thus perform a very real community service. Several of the ever-increasing numbers of regional professional theatres in the United States have been established as a result of enthusiasms generated in colleges theatre departments, and certainly the even larger number of mostly amateur community theatre groups have resulted from the same impetus.

A greater degree of specialization is evident at the post-graduate level, and here the training is most likely to be directly professionally-oriented (that is, to playwriting, to directing, to acting, to designing). Here, too, one finds a larger utilization of the so-called "professionals" as theatre-artists. Many of these graduates go directly into professional theatre, although some also go to educational institutions and other theatre establishments, and some concentrate on theatre research, possibly on the doctoral level.

Though the whole scheme of theatre in the educational process in the United States may seem somewhat amorphous, and certainly less than ideal, those of us who believe in right education as the only hope for a democratic society and an informed electorate are pleased that the impact and efficacy of theatre studies seems now to be becoming more widely recognized, not only as a means of providing live and lively theatre experiences for larger and larger segments of the population, but also as an end in itself as it gives a sense of fulfillment and joy to individual participants.

GROUP V
Conference
Report

RICHARD SCHECHNER

*Improving Design for the Technical Function:
Scenography, Structure and Function*

The Panel:

THEODORE HOFFMAN, U.S.A., *Chairman*

PAUL BAKER, U.S.A.

GARY GAISER, U.S.A.

K. KOIZUMI, Japan

DOROTHY MADDEN, U.S.A.

HOWARD MALPAS, U.S.A.

SOMBHU MITRA, India

ARTHUR RISSER, U.S.A.

KOSTA SPAIC, Yugoslavia

GYORGI TOVSTONOGOV, U.S.S.R.

WIM VESSEUR, Netherlands

CONTEMPORARY TECHNOLOGY IS MAKING VAST CHANGES IN OUR UNDERSTANDING OF experience. Technology is not simply the acquisition of new skills, the development of new means towards established ends. Marshall McLuhan's popular slogan, "the medium is the message," relates as efficiently to technology as it does to environments: the character of Einsteinian physics, transactional psychology and sociology, and electronic circuitry is such as to re-shape the very texture of living. Each age routinely claims for itself the title of "revolutionary." However, there is much evidence to support the claim in our own times.

It is of course extremely difficult, if not unwise, to predict what shapes the evolving arts may take. We are in the condition of travelers through an extraordinarily stimulating and complex landscape. However, we may be certain that some of the enduring functions of art will persist, no matter what shape these functions take. The theatre will continue to focus on the affective relations between individuals; on the large social forces that are rightfully clamoring and demonstrating for political and social changes: on those affairs of the human soul which relate individual and individuals to larger, collective forces.

World Environment and Architecture

Architecture can no longer be thought of simply in terms of this or that building. Just as facilities and spaces exist *within* buildings, so buildings themselves exist in *relation* to other structures and to a general social environment. Cities are not—or should not be—random collections of buildings; they are themselves organic and correlated spaces, entirely capable of growth, development and death. The impact of social change—and the need for change—effects the development of theatre and a reciprocity exists between buildings designed as

theatres and the social world in which these theatres must exist. It may be a dangerous time to build theatres; but theatres will be built, and we must exercise special care concerning them. We must ask (1) what is the place of this particular theatre within the community; (2) what is the artistic function of the theatre—who is going to run it, and why. Thus architectural questions are addressed not only internally but externally: the theatre architect and director have an obligation not only to the artistic personnel who will live within the building, but to the audience who will come to it. And this second obligation is not always to follow, but sometimes to lead. A theatre building should be built around a mature theatre idea, an operating theatrical philosophy. Theatre buildings which pre-exist the purposes for which they are built can only be architectural mongrels and social anomalies.

Thus the first director of any theatre is its architect. The space he provides will determine the function on the theatre. It is therefore very important for the architect to understand theatrical artistry, to have at his side informed theatrical advisers, and to design the theatre to some specific purpose. There are, it seems to us, several possible general architectural models for theatre buildings. However, before outlining these we would point out that a highly individualized theatre artist may demand a special space, and insofar as his talent demands it, this special space should not be denied him—particularly for reasons which have more to do with money than with art.

1. *Limited Space.* Whether a theatre is a proscenium, thrust or arena (or any other *specific* space) it has inherent in it some limitations. Many theatre artists prefer to work within the conventions established by these limitations. Some of their most creative work issues from the confrontation between these limitations and their imaginations. One need only think of what Brecht did in the Berlin Ensemble or Tyrone Guthrie at his theatre in Minneapolis.

2. *Multi-form* (sometimes called multi-purpose). In America the most well-known examples of this kind of architectural solution to scenic problems are the Loeb Center at Harvard and, in a less adaptable way, the Vivian Beaumont Theatre at Lincoln Center. Although there may be some way of achieving a successful multi-form theatre, none of those now in existence have been successful. The necessities of specific forms—whether they be proscenium, thrust, arena, or what-have-you—are such that attempted combinations or transformations of one into the other usually result in bastardized architecture and staging limitations.

The multi-usage theatre, designed to be used for theatre and other purposes suffers from many of the disadvantages of the multiform theatre.

It is particularly important to note that classical, modern and the evolving forms of contemporary dance demand spaces of their own. Where dance is understood as an element of stage movement, quite obviously it can and should function within the theatre. But where dance strikes out on its own, it needs its own spaces.

3. *Flexible Space.* Unlike the combinations of proscenium-thrust-arena, ideally flexible space is open space which offers the theatre artist cubic modules with which to build whatever theatrical scenic experience he wishes. Flexible space is in many ways the "opposite" of limited space. It invites the director (or

whoever controls the *mise-en-scene*) to establish for each performance special spatial limitations designed particularly for that performance.

4. *Indeterminate or Found Space*. Some theatre artists wish to work outside, in the streets, on castle steps, in fields—or wherever. They may even, as in the case of some intermedia (happenings) performances, prefer to work in several widely separated spaces simultaneously. Wherever these performances—whether of texts or of non-textual theatre—occur, they enter into a negotiation with their environments. The space is “given;” it pre-exists the theatrical function and will continue to exist after the performance. The exciting scenic possibilities of this kind of staging come from the necessary inter-relation between the performance and the found space. The performance does not try to hide or convert the found space, but rather to enter into its possibilities.

Relationships Among Various Artists of the Theatre

We have long given lip-service to the proposition that the director, actors, designers of sets, lights, costumes, choreographer or movement specialist, and so on should work together. However, in practice, only the director and the actors work in close and continuing cooperation. The director's interpretation should be conceived in spatial terms. It is necessary that rehearsals be used for *all* the collaborating artists. To take such an idea seriously would mean the expenditure of additional money and time. It must be possible for a set designer, for example, to evolve his vision of the scenic environment during rehearsals as he watches the directors and actors at work. He should be encouraged to try various solutions to problems (as actors should be encouraged). All the theatre artists must be treated as artists with room for exploration, the presentation of various solutions, the practical possibility to try these solutions.

The Text

One can either work with texts or without them. The work with texts cannot be considered on the same basis as the work without texts. And even within the texted theatre, widely varying attitudes can be identified.

The classic or traditional regard for the text, a regard which has increased since the beginning of this century with its detailed historical researches is based on the assumption that the text is the basic structure of the play—that from the text the director, actor, designer and other collaborating artists should deduce their production style. A strong body of opinion maintains that the performing artists are under an obligation to the audience to produce the play as written. Of course interpretation is essential—it is interpretation which translates a literary text into a theatrical event. But these interpretations have definite parameters. Cuts should be avoided or only judiciously made; if the playwright is alive they should be made only with his consent; the sequence of scenes should be maintained. The interpretation of the text will change according to the social needs and understanding of particular audiences. Thus interpretation, like theatre technology, is an evolutionary process.

However, traditional attitudes toward the text are changing in some quarters. Zefferelli's interpretations of Shakespeare, or Peter Brook's handling of *Marat/Sade* indicate a tendency in which the *mise-en-scene* is as important as the text.

The work of Brecht, Guthrie and Vilar tends in this direction. In the hands of theatre artists such as these, texts are transformed into something other than they are traditionally understood to be.

Still more radical attitudes toward the text can be seen in the work of Jerzy Grotowski who rearranges texts, moving single lines or entire scenes, dividing or uniting characters, changing settings, mode, tone and intent. For Grotowski and those who work like him, the text is *material*, to be used and reconstructed to suit the vision of a particular production. The text is taken down from its privileged position and enters the theatre with the same perils and possibilities as the actors. It rehearses with them, changes, develops and takes its shape from the demands of the production.

Some productions use no prepared text. The actors work together with the writer who suggests themes or prepares scenarios. During the working period a performance evolves. *America Hurrah* and *Viet Rock* were written that way. Still other productions are completely improvisatory; while some intermedia events do not use spoken language at all.

One of the most interesting problems in this area is the way in which non-spoken "language" (gesture, movement, lights, scenic elements) have—in some performances—replaced the written text. It is as if the vision of Antonin Artaud were being fulfilled. A hieroglyphic theatre of sound, sight, and sensuous imagery seems possible. Although this theatre is in no way threatening the existence of the traditional theatre of plays, it is interesting a great number of our younger practitioners.

Human Values

As new instruments and methods become available to the theatre, certain traditional values are called into question. There is a need both to preserve these values and to give the new methods a change to show themselves. It is too early to tell whether or not an unyielding conflict will develop between these two attitudes.

Certainly within the traditional theatre, the questions of the hero and of the possibilities of modern tragedy have been discussed again and again. As the older prerogatives of the individual pass into the hands of the collective, classical heroes and tragedies become more remote from our experience and become the property of the mass media. Few contemporary plays have had believable, contemporary heroes. Post World War II drama has given us the absurd and the existential hero, and the tragedy of metaphysical conflict. But these heroes are often comic figures and these tragedies owe more to burlesque and farce than they do to Aeschylus, Shakespeare or Ibsen.

Certain new drama and much non-textual or textually rearranged theatre substitutes collective experience for individual crisis. In some of these performances, there is the spirit of collective celebration, social ritual and participation.

Impact of New Technology

The new technology can be used in two ways:

1. To enhance the production of plays in the traditional way. Here the research in electronics, plastics, scenery construction, audio systems, and so on can be

put to efficient use by the director and his staff. The new technology can help the director to realize his intentions more completely.

2. The new technology itself is an environment, and one which is so radically different from previous environments that it may call into being an entirely new form of theatre. The technical elements in this new theatre would not simply "support" an interpretation: they would themselves become the central source of the audience's experience, the organic subject matter of the theatre.

Manipulation of Space: Scene Design

Even a bad camera can reproduce nature better and more completely than the best scene painter. The interest in scene design is therefore no longer centered on duplicating nature. Scene design has become the manipulation of space. Its elements include constructed material, light, costumes, bodies-in-motion. The scene designer no longer looks at an event; he "looks-in." Therefore it becomes necessary for the designer to be schooled not only in his basic craft and the history of design, art and architecture; he must also know acting, movement, environmental construction and social psychology.

One might say that fifty years ago the central concern of designing was to duplicate a place. Today the designer is concerned with showing how one scenic reality is transformed into another: he must know the rules of transformation and movement. The setting is no longer static; often it participates actively in the production, harmonizing with or opposing thematically the gestures, movement and words of the actors.

Environmental Theatre

There are several ways in which this term may be used. First, there is theatre in the streets, at factories, in castles, and so on. Here the performance of texts is adapted to various given environments. Work in this area is particularly important if we are to see a truly popular theatre—for it becomes increasingly clear that the theatre will have to go to the people, and not vice-versa. The idea in this kind of environmental theatre is not to disguise the given space and make it into some kind of "temporary theatre," but to explore creatively the demands of the environment—marrying the implications of the text to implications of the found space.

Another sense of environmental theatre is that kind of happening that bases itself almost entirely on found space. Here the director of the performance begins with space, and evolves his entire performance out of the space. The environment thus becomes the most important element in this kind of performance, the intention of which is often to make participants (sometimes there are no actors or professional performers) fully aware of their physical environments. It is conceivable that a definite feedback could be established between this kind of environmental theatre and the more traditional theatre.

A third kind of environmental theatre is not theatre at all—but social ritual, political demonstration, controlled public event, church service and procession. These have long been powerful weapons for both social change and control.

These rituals need to be carefully studied by theatre people because they may yield important resources in dealing with collective experience.

Means of Evaluating New Work

Traditional aesthetics lays down its arms before much of the new work. Theatre artists wonder whether the new work will be fruitful: can it be assimilated into existing theatre or will it become a separate art form? If we are to avoid empty polemics it would seem best to encourage experimentation and not rush to judgment. The methods of evaluation always follow practice and we are not yet sufficiently familiar with the new work to propose hard measurements. It is enough, at present, to know that reputable artists and thinkers are interested in these new modes. One could ask, however, what social needs this work satisfies, what its internal shape is, and how, even negatively, it relates to traditional aesthetics and ethical values. But any conclusions drawn from such analysis are tentative. As Chekhov once wrote to Gorki: "Do the work, Bobchik."

Postscript

A Statement

by GARY W. GAISER

1. What are the means for our theatre of today? How are they modified? What are the conditions?

The new technologies include the areas of the mass media of communication and the areas of manufacturing: these include the problems of disposal as much and often more than creation.

2. What impact has mass production, automation and potential abundance done to our point of view?

We are careless about materials; waste and destruction often results because replacement is easy: little cost to the individual often; it is all part of the overhead—of the government, the institution, the corporation. We might as well relax.

Mass media often tend to neutralize the specific meaning or referent of the word. Because there is too much of the precise to hold on to all, a blurring results and only a feeling, an impression or sensation is the residue!

3. What impact have the new technologies and new materials on our theatre?

a. Now available are plastics that fill space according to mold, that can be foamed for fill, inflated for space, serve as a skin for protection or support, in all colored or painted with some permanence or treated to take color. The realm of the costumier is well supplied with new materials even as that of the decorator.

The new developments will be slow in coming if we depend on building contractors and their methods. However, given such a break through, lacework steel and plastics, among many advances, can provide many more startling innovations than Expo 67 suggests. These are innovations in shape, uninterrupted space and

adjustable shape or space. Due to acceleration of change in structural design, the problem of easy elimination or disposal of outmoded structures will have to become an art and skill rather than an eyesore and delay in the near future.

b. Two major trends are discernible in the development of moving structures in the theatre—in the house but on stage for most part. (1) The first is the use of relatively fixed facilities (built in) for suspension, horizontal shifting, elevation and revolving. (2) Secondly is the facility to develop flexibility in the location and destination of the use of these machines in the theatre, that is to say, to provide custom-made operating locations wherever needed for movement to fit the individual play and theatre in terms of a director's design needs.

c. Machines to provide light have continued to evolve. These developments range from simple fill light to key and spotlighting to projections. Any type of control is available, but main improvements are generally limited in use to amount of light and its distribution. The potential exists to extend this present limited use of controls to include angle and color control as well.

4. What have been the interactions between these changes and production in the performing arts and the theatre?

In part man seems to be trying to emphasize his individuality in this mass world and mass effects.

a. He has resented the proliferation of things because they are so abundant and overwhelming: he feels he has been dwarfed by size and quantity. He is unable frequently to absorb what is available.

There is no order with freedom in this mass of new abundance in processing, making, and building: the new and outworn are side by side; one design is next to a totally different one; many points of view are apparently incompatible; many personality elements vie for expression and dominance; we have facts for startling improvement in education, particularly early in life, and don't use them; we are so desirous for answers that the charletans often have as much opportunity as the honest artists and well-meaning experimenters.

All this leads to (1) a portrayal of our lack of direction, our aimlessness, and our confusion. (2) It is a withdrawal from it all to condemn the world for its failure—a kind of spiritual suicide or isolation, which however, begins to define the problem (theatre of absurd, literary or pantomimic). (3) In the third place there is a revulsion against his world and a wish on the part of man by contrast "to be," to express himself somehow as a man in control of something even if no more than a mudbath or be a winner in a urination contest.

b. While our psychoanalysis remains a chance tinkering with the human psyche (though chemistry is having some success) and our art as actors has hardly progressed beyond the division of mind and matter, we are beginning to interrelate in some companies, countries and schools: true ensembles of working actors; ensembles of the spirit and the physical tools within the actor; ensembles of actors and moving or acting scenery; ensembles of light and projections with actors and definite communication still in control; ensembles of genres, *particularly that of the dance* to enrich production; and the *tout ensemble* some resolution of the fundamental problems of time and space in relation to action throughout but particularly at the beginning of the creative process in theatre.

c. Finally, in the performing arts, the happenings of many kinds reveal another attempt to work out of the chaos of the abundance of things to achieve some function and meaning in our environment. These are apparently designed by keeping style or overall design within the decision of director or writer of the happenings but leaving execution to chance or at best limited direction—all in part an abdication on the part of the director. It provides the place, part and limits for the action or in theatrical terms, the stage, the props, and the scenario, but leaving the amount of action or interaction as well as the manner and degree to the chance operation of these or at best loosely suggested interaction—it creates so many more possibilities and chances that the results, at present, are hardly in the category of artistry. The duplication of excellence is an essential characteristic of the performing arts. That standard is so far rarely met. Instead we have surprise, perhaps a new insight and certainly sensation as the lot of the curious audience.

At present the theatre is very much in a state of becoming, particularly in its scenographic elements. This is particularly true of the many agents who are operating in it and who are often not in close communication with each other.

Postscript

A Statement

by K. KOIZUMI

The following comments coincide with what I intend to state in the forthcoming Montreal Colloquium in response to the question: "Advances in contemporary theatre technology: a hindrance or a help?" I maintain that it is of course help and not hindrance. This is because technology or technicians always aim at simply increasing or cultivating possibilities for production techniques and never intend to compel the director to choose a specific theatrical technique.

In other words, a technician is one who offers possibilities of production technique. What to choose from these various possibilities offered, and to what extent to utilize them is entirely up to the director.

It seems to me that from now on we should not limit theatrical expressions to the proscenium opening or the acting area, but spread them throughout the entire auditorium.

Currently already to an extent acting and sound effect have been moving to this direction. I believe it is necessary to attempt similar pioneering with regard to lighting and sets.

For this reason it is desirable to stop incorporating architectural and permanent decoration, and to set up scenographic and temporary decoration in the auditorium.

Theatrical technical terms often become hindrance in communicating, being confused and unorganized. This is true not only internationally, but also within my own country, Japan. (In Japan there are two major theatrical production

companies, namely Shochiku and Toho. There are some different usages between the two.)

It is important to systematize technical term usage. I think such a work would be one of the most important and urgent tasks to be performed when the organization of the Japanese theatrical technicians now in preparation begins to function.

It seems to me most reasonable to add in front of a proscenium type stage a provision which can change into an apron stage, steps, auditorium floor or orchestra pit in case staging of various type performance is required of a single theatre.

Today on Japanese stages the flying equipment is handled completely electrically in counter-weight method, with two or three changeable speeds. I would like to know if the manual rope flying equipment would still be necessary from the director's point of view.

Concerning designing of theatrical architecture; Artistic design cannot with finality be judged suitable or unsuitable because elements of subjective taste of the designer or the one who appraises it enter in. But, we must be on guard not to leave any regrets as to the functional aspect which can easily be evaluated.

Therefore, it seems to me best to have a panel of architects, directors, scenographers, lighting technicians, acoustic designers and other specialists take a leading part. (It would be best if we could get an architect knowledgeable in performing arts as its chairman.)

Postscript

A Statement

by ARTHUR RISSER

The topic suggests that consideration be given to the functional space within a theatre, the structure necessary to enclose it and the scenography used to provide the environment for the *event*—the theatrical production. The space includes that which is used by the audience and the performer—actors, dancers and the technological devices which are to assist them. In the creation of the environment the artistic director should have the possibility of using the contemporarily available technologies. Therefore the structure should provide these and do it in such a way that they will be easy to use.

Architecture involves the design of space to serve a function and to accomplish it in a manner which makes it a comfortable space to be in, and which is at the same time aesthetically satisfying and structurally sound. Architectural space must of necessity have some restriction or limitation, but the degree of limitation should be the decision of the theatre artist and made in terms of what he can afford and what he believes will be most suitable to him. The result obviously, because of the individual preference of each director, will be theatre structures of several styles. (Directors would probably like to have a different theatre for each

production, but even in an affluent society this is not practical.) In situations where an institution is limited to one theatre form, and because of the personal preference of theatre directors to work in a particular theatre form, the selection of a director may have to be made on these terms.

Architecture and the theatrical event are analogous in the sense that the creation of both involve a synthesis, but they differ in that architecture is permanent whereas the theatrical event is temporal. In no two art forms is the creation of one so influenced by its relationship to the other. Therefore the successful design of the permanent one is predicated on its ability to provide the space and atmosphere necessary for the creation of the temporal one. The solution to this problem should not be difficult if it involved only a communication between the architect and the theatre artist and if the theatre artist were able to select the architect with whom he knows he can communicate. In this country communication between these two artists is complicated by the fact that there are two forces which sometimes stand between them: one is a third party, a board of directors or trustees, who usually has the upper hand because it controls the money to pay for the building (space) and the second are building codes which often make it impossible for the architect to give the theatre artist what he wants and needs. Add to this difficult situation the possibility that the controlling interest's (board of trustees) concept of the function of the theatre may be opposed to the concept of the theatre artist, and the result is inevitably a structure whose design is not entirely suitable for the theatrical function.

The real problem of improving design for the theatrical function is one of communication between the artists involved in the design process and the *lay* persons who control the finances for the project.

Postscript

A Statement

by WIM VESSEUR

I cannot express myself fast enough in another language to react immediately. So this:

(1) Theatre is life's *magic-box*, but in the very inside is always *human life*, not only as in a normal mirror, but as in a *magic* mirror, that reflects not only our statement of today, but reflects from the past, and maybe to eternity or the cosmos.

(2) Theatre is a part of social life, so it always *must* have relation with today's life and has to be done in or at a place that can reach the living people.

(3) The traditional mediums are only usable when they suit 1) and 2). Otherwise, theatre is a museum or for a (happy?) few.

(4) Theatre *has* to be creative and magic, otherwise it will die with all of us.

(5) Creation is not only meeting, confronting, and experimenting. It is planning and performance and belief.

Soliloquies and Passages-at-Arms:
Selections Transcribed from the Conference

A Note on the Transcriptions

"Ah, I am mixing up your beautiful cadences and
spoiling them, am I not, darling?"

—*Candida*, Act III

THE DISCUSSIONS OF THE FIVE PANELS WERE RECORDED ON TAPE. DISCUSSIONS OF Panels I and V were recorded in the sound booths of large conference rooms at the Department of State on professional equipment; the others were recorded on portable machines with a single microphone placed in the center of the long conference table. The inevitable recording difficulty was compounded by the fact that many speakers talked in a language not their own and by the problems of translation: sometimes the original speaker was recorded, sometimes the extempore translation of State Department translators.

In attempting to transcribe discussions of interest from the panel meetings I have been forced to assume a greater than usual editorial latitude. I have eliminated without comment the false starts, repetition and general hemming-and-hawing that are inevitable in informal discourse, and, in the interest of readability, I have restructured broken sentences, sometimes combining, sometimes separating elements that were clear enough at the conference table but that seemed obscure in written form. I have been at pains, however, to preserve the words of the speaker in all crucial matters, and have attempted to retain the tone and the emphasis of the original. Any major cut is indicated with the usual marks of ellision. What is here represents the essence of the discussion, at least.

—TRAVIS BOGARD

From Group I: Training Theatre Personnel

In which Mr. Duncan Ross, M. René Hainaux, Mr. Mikail Tsarev and Mr. Arthur Lithgow, among others, debate the Stanislavski System, Cheironomia, the lassitude of American acting and other matters relevant to the integration of actor training.

Lippman: If you need two different people to teach voice on the one hand and speech on the other, how many people do you need to have an "integrated" training program. Isn't it possible that if you do not have a few people who are skillful in a number of areas that you run the danger of having many individual experts in each individual aspect of study? I should think this would present a complicated challenge to integration. Is this a dilemma or is it not?

Ross: From my own experience and philosophy, I would say the fewer specialists the better. At Bristol, I was able finally to obliterate the barriers in students' minds between one course and another. The difficulty arises as soon as you construct a curriculum in which you give labels to specific times of the day and particular labels to certain individuals. The student begins to compartmentalize his training himself. Every effort has to be made to dissolve these psychological categories.

Over some five years at Bristol, it became possible by having a small staff who worked very closely together to arrive at a situation where the students did not know whether at any particular moment they were having a voice or a movement or an acting class. The faculty was able to move across lines, visit one another's classes and deliberately work on specific problems with specific individuals who could be taken from the acting class into the movement class—which at any moment could become a voice class. A small faculty working together over a period of years can dissolve the psychological barriers of categories and become responsible for the whole of the individual's work.

Lippman: Bill, I'm sorry, but that doesn't satisfy me. How did a class suddenly become not an acting class, but a voice class, a movement class, a judo class or what have you?

Ross: Well, it becomes a movement class or a voice class or both at the same time if you start your movement very early—to include making noises for example. The development of the expressiveness of the voice is intimately related to the total movement pattern of the body. I have given up almost entirely the use of mental imagery to develop the kind of emotional expression I am trying to get in an actor. I now use almost entirely bodily movements in order to get the kind of emotional vocal expression that I ask the student to discern.

In other words, in a passage from Shakespeare, such as "Now entertain conjecture of the time," it is possible to ask the student after very little training, making it seem quite a sensible remark to him, what is the movement feeling of the words "Now," "entertain" and "conjecture," and ask him in fact to make these movements overtly and to speak at the same time. The voice then automatically takes on the rhythmic and emotional expression that Shakespeare dis-

cerned. This works well with Shakespeare, who was extremely aware of the kinesthetic aspects of language. I used to work energetically on mental imagery to develop emotional coloration in the voice, but now I use almost entirely bodily movements to do this. The wide, flexible, bodily effort patterns, heavily based on the theories of Laban, seem to me of crucial importance in training an actor. I have come to the conclusion that what we are talking about all the time are patterns of movement, patterns of activity. I do not want to get into deep philosophical questions, but it does mean that what we are talking about in the human being is a structure of activity, as the philosopher Whitehead put it. This now governs the whole of my teaching.

Allen: Is what you are doing anticipated historically by the modifications of Stanislavski that Mikhail Chekov made?

Ross: I was bothered by Chekov at first because it seemed to me that the particular shapes of the body that were taken up in psychological gesture were those which carried the imaginative impulse. But later, it became clear to me that what he is really talking about is the rhythm that the body goes through in order to reach those particular psychological gestures. He anticipated the sort of approach I am talking about, but I think that Laban goes into it more specifically. Laban's notations form a good conceptual basis for the training of the actor. And I believe there is a teacher, Yat Malmgren, who has gone into this quite deeply.

Lithgow: It is likely that William Shakespeare's actors had specific and traditional conscious and unconscious movements that obtained on the stage. It is also quite clear that traditionalistic theatres like the French or the Italian and other European theatres also depend not only upon the enjoyment of listening to their language, but upon their characteristic Gallic or Italianate movements—shrugs, eyebrows, hands and what not—which have specific symbolic emotional content—do they not? These enter their histrionic style in an organic way.

Ross: It was my colleague, Dr. Joseph, who first drew my attention to the *cheironomia*, the Elizabethan rhetorical hand movements associated with oratory. He has a story which illustrates, I think, what Arthur Lithgow is talking about. He gave an experimental presentation of some Shakespeare scenes in the old Mermaid Theatre in London with some professional actors using these hand movements. Many eminent theatre and literary people came to see it. The consensus of report after the performance was "I didn't notice any formal movements, but I did notice that the text is extraordinarily clear."

This, therefore, becomes a particularly important problem in the American theatre, where not only is there no recognizable American way of moving—(or perhaps where there are so many)—but where, as soon as any mannerism begins to be noticed, it is eschewed, as though it were rather unclean to be identified with a movement mannerism. That really is one of the problems of training in the American theatre.

I think it is a serious criticism of most training programs in colleges that there is hardly any movement training incorporated as a basic necessity of actor training. The result is that students work on a Stanislavski basis, but become as a result actors who are trained to imitate themselves. The question of there being special American movements is not really to the point. Joseph

made me aware of the basic kinds of movements that were drawn out of the Elizabethan orator. If you begin to be aware of these, you will see them being used every day by ordinary human beings of the present time. They are not a new, special codification like ballet technique. They are drawn from the observations of ordinary human beings.

The question of mannerisms that become noticed is central. If the actor is trained properly, he will understand from the beginning that what he has to concentrate on is the objective—in other words, on something which may happen in a moment, something which is not present at this actual second. If the organism is always directed into the future, then the behavior of the organism has the quality of spontaneity. It is only when the organism's attention is directed onto itself that mannerisms become noticeable. They become what we call self-attentive or self-conscious.

The real problem of actor training is to determine how you modify people's behavior, how you enlarge and develop the flexibility of the imaginative organism, without at any time directing the attention of the organism toward any specific behavioral feature. What many teachers do is precisely this: they continually turn the attention of the organism to specific behavioral features. The moment this is done, the behavioral feature has an entirely new quality, a self-attentive quality. You find it exemplified in the vocal work of Sir John Gielgud, for instance. He now is almost incapable of speaking without listening to himself. This is a habit now; he doesn't even know he's doing it. This kind of training is one of the main criticisms I have against the former English methods which met with a general revolt during the last five years I was in England.

. . .

Hainaux: . . . When I witnessed acting classes in the United States, I came to the conclusion that certain peculiarities could be noticed that you wouldn't notice in Europe. I noticed a certain slowness in movement that was apparent when students were interpreting texts which were primarily European. After working with them for a while, I had the impression that there was also a certain slowness to react. When I talked to the students and tried to understand why they seemed to be slow to change emotional reactions and feeling and things of that sort, I felt that this braking action on their part, their slowness to react might be due to poor background in the Stanislavski method. In other words, it seems that the students, in order to change a feeling, had to have a great deal of prior preparation just before that movement or change—as in Marivaux or others where suddenly the character changes his feeling quite rapidly. Well, two or three cues before that, the student starts having to prepare himself for this change. I want to be very cautious in this particular statement, because in point of fact, I don't have too much experience in this particular area.

Ross: I think René's observations are very acute about the American situation, and I agree in part with what he says pertaining to Marivaux. It also pertains to Congreve and others. Working in these areas with American students has led me more and more away from the Stanislavski structure to a more direct structure. There is no question of the rhythmic factors which are in the text and which speak directly to the actor who is sensitively alive to rhythmic movement in himself. I agree with René that a misunderstanding of some of the Stanislavski

ideas does lead to a slowness of reaction. But apart from that, I would say that there is possibly something more native than this. The American rhythms of speech are themselves slow, compared to European. I have been on radio programs where people phone in while you are actually speaking on the radio. Quite regularly they complain that I speak too fast, that they cannot understand my pace. It is not merely a question of change of accent. It is in fact a question of rhythmic features. One of the points of the Stanislavski system which I reject is the notion of relaxation which is continually being presented in classes in America. In fact, usually, "relax" has become equivalent to "collapse."

I have now come to the situation where the only Stanislavski feature I can readily accept and use is that of the objective—and even here I use it only in terms of the immediate objective of the particular action in relation to another individual.

So I would say that it's not just the Stanislavski system that is the problem in America. It is a certain kind of relaxed rhythm characteristic of American life, which however, because it exists makes it possible for us to avoid many problems that we have in England, hypertension, for example and inhibition. Yet it is also true to say that America is bursting with talent, because the kind of relaxation, the kind of slow freedom that they have permits us to avoid many problems that we have in England, for example, of hypertension and inhibition.

. . .

Lithgow: Mr. Hainaux, when he spoke about the characteristic slowness that he has noted in American style of acting, prefaced his remark by saying he thinks that it is a *bad* application of the Stanislavski method—a misunderstanding, a misuse, a misinterpretation in preparation. I agree and this is a difficulty directors have when they are working with a company, particularly young companies of actors who have been trained in psychological realism. They tend, some time in the later part of the rehearsal period, to be in despair over the pacing of the show because it has slowed down to a point where it is simply going to be boring because it is so slow. So the simplistic direction is given, "For God's sake, pick it up! Pick up the cues! Pick up the pace! Let's get this goddam show on the road!"

The thing has slowed down to the point of desperation, even from the director's point of view. The curious thing is that perhaps in emphasizing psychological realism we may have sometimes tended to shift the emphasis to preparation so that it becomes interesting in itself. We can all think of certain American actors in which the "take," the reaction, the preparation becomes more interesting than the response to the bones of the dialogue. There is a long pause, and a marvelously interesting one-act play goes on before the actor finally responds to a simple direction like, "Won't you sit down, please?" He assimilates an entire history of what could possibly have been meant and what subtle innuendoes can be indicated by that piece of dialogue.

This is a problem because sometimes we have shifted not to the dialogue, nor to the author's intention, but to the actor's preparation and his response to every line. This creates slowness.

American culture has a built-in vulnerability to this kind of thing because Americans are slow in the way Mr. Ross suggested. They reveal back-placed voices and sometimes regionally languid behavior for which we must somehow compensate.

But have you noticed, Mr. Hainaux, that in another kind of theatre, the American musical theatre, something altogether different obtains? Now we have energy. Now we have pace and response. No one is worrying anymore about psychological realism. We must dance, we must sing, we must jump, we must turn. Even in the dialogue parts of a musical show, there is an aliveness, a loudness, a directness that is quite different from the psychologically realistic scenes in the legitimate theatre. These are important distinctions. Certain American actors have different personalities. They can perform in a musical show with great alertness. Then, when they perform in a play that demands psychological realism, wild horses won't drag a response out of them. I mean, won't drag an immediate response from them. The same actor will slow down to the point of distracting boredom. Perhaps you have noticed this.

Hainaux: Yes. The example you have given is striking. Nevertheless, I feel that you can observe a difference in approach. In one class, I have seen the same students reacting very slowly and having difficulty interpreting the text, and in another, responding with movements, with extremely modern music, with rapidity and resourcefulness and flexibility and suppleness. They were so fast that European students would have trouble keeping up with them. In any case, as Mr. Ross pointed out, talent does exist.

Ross: To follow up some of the remarks that Arthur and René have made, one of the fathers of neuro-psychology, the Nobel prizewinner, Sherrington, in his beautiful book, *Man on His Nature*, remarks, "If I am pursuing a clue in a crossword puzzle, it does not help the operation if I turn a part of my mind to watching myself do it. This tends to a disintegration of the self."

This seems to me to be at the very basis of the criticism of *An Actor Prepares* and similar works. Particularly in the American context, the result is these enormous pauses, where, as you say, whole one-act plays are going on in the transition between one line and the next. In many cases, this develops as a rhythmic pattern of behavior, when in fact no transition is going on, when all there is is a kind of rhythmic pause, with no thought whatsoever. It becomes a habit to act at this pace.

Elements in the Stanislavski system do what Sherrington objected to. For instance the well-known passage in *An Actor Prepares* on the relaxation of the muscles. The good student—the one who always has the right answers for the teacher—goes home and works on relaxation. He tries to relax one muscle and immediately a tension develops somewhere else. At the end he is in a much worse state than he was when he started. Significantly, at least in the American translation, no alternative is offered. The point is that concerning oneself with relaxation as a particular thing to attend to produces a state of complete disorganization. Stanislavski gives us no alternative except to point out that a cat doesn't have a problem. He doesn't explain why the cat has no problem.

Similarly with many of the other techniques. I was a very devoted Stanislavskite when I started to be a teacher. It is only under the influence of having to

face my students who demanded truth and who continually expressed dissatisfaction with some of the things I was teaching that I had to search in myself and say, "What is truth?" I have come to this conclusion: that we have to regard the situation from a holistic point of view. We must be very careful when we are talking about voice and speech not to confuse speech with language. It is possible to examine language as something which is built up from elements—with morphemes forming into words and words into grammatical structures. But we have to face the fact that speech, or the vocal expression of the human being does not develop this way. It is clear from studies of the development of child speech that what in fact happens is babbling of large wholes of activity which slowly differentiate into more complex structures of specific connotations, exactly analogous to the way in which a one-celled organism, the beginning of ourselves, develops from and differentiates into specialized structures from the whole, not by starting with separate structures and building them together.

I am sure that we have to think of our training as actors in the same way that a biological entity develops. To be misled by linguistic structures or analyses into supposing that these are appropriate for teaching the development of speech or the development of movement, is to make a mistake.

I am particularly interested in such questions. Let me tell you of a young actress who came to us when she was quite unknown. She arrived on Monday morning. She had never seen the text. We had hired her by telephone. She took the text from my office at 10:00 in the morning. By 11:30, although she had not finished reading the play, she did her first walk-through *in character*. The young lady's name was Joan Plowright. It seems to me that unless we as teachers can encompass conceptually what Miss Plowright and other actors *do*, we are not in fact teaching what *is*. I've had the experience myself, in exactly the same situation, of knowing, as I read the text, what to do. At once. I insist that we find some way to train which doesn't inhibit this or just turn this question over to magic and say "It is talent." Unless we find some way to encompass and understand this, and to promote this kind of thinking in the actor, we are getting in his way.

. . .

Tsarev: It seems to me that it would be possible to talk at great length about the Stanislavski system but, nonetheless, there would still be some aspects of it which would be unclarified, since it is not only a *theory* but is also a *system of practice*. The system is taught in school, and implemented in practice. Thus it is a system of practice. If we listen to what has been said around this table, it seems to me that the system is understood by some persons in a rather narrow sense. It is much wider, much more liberal, much freer. It isn't a dogmatic doctrine; it is a creative doctrine. It goes without saying that in every country where this doctrine is taught and studied it is necessary to take into account the characteristics of a given country and of a given nation.

In the matter of relaxation and tension: it is necessary to be very careful in one's approach to students—directing them, but not forcing them, carefully explaining to them what the teacher wants them to do, yet requiring that the student himself be entirely free.

Relaxation. Everything starts with this. Tension has to exist, what it is depends upon the characteristics of the role which is being studied. There is a beginning, a combination, a *dénouement*—in every role. But the important thing is that this tension should not become a muscular tension. It should rather be the result of the freedom of all the muscles of the student. It is not supposed to be mechanical tension. That would be completely to distort the sense of Stanislavski. The movements are supposed to be entirely light and free. They are not supposed to indicate a lot of muscular power. They are supposed to be done with uncommon freedom and relaxation, and to be very easy. This, I think, is the difference, as I understand it, between the meaning of relaxation and the meaning of tension. The whole point is a proper understanding, proper thought. From a proper understanding of the thought, the proper movements arise. And then the movements will be correct.

From Group II: Theatre and Its Developing Audience

The Theatre of the Rhinoceros and The Theatre as a Star: *definitions evolving from a discussion by Messrs. Lukes, Beckerman, Frankel and Mitra.*

Lukes: Prague is now considered as one of the theatre capitals of Europe. There, our problem is not to make the theatre more acceptable to multitudes. The way to make theatre acceptable to multitudes is not to generalize, to make theatre to which even rhinoceroses will come, but to specify different theatres to attract different, specific circles of audiences—not to give general ideas, but very specific ideas, very specific vision, and by very specific means attract people who are willing and able to share in these experiences with particular artists.

Beckerman: As these new organisms developed, was there a point at which they received support enabling them to get a building and become permanent? At what point in their development did that occur? How much did they have to prove themselves before they could gain a subsidy of some sort?

Lukes: All the theatres which are fully professional received subsidies from the municipalities or from the government soon.

Beckerman: Was there some system or some organization of individuals in the municipality that was sensitive to these developments so that as a company progressed it received support?

Lukes: There is such an organization in Prague. It is called the State Theatre Studio—a huge theatrical “shop” which comprises a number of groups. One is an experimental drama group called the Actors’ Club, established only two or three years ago. Another is the Lanterna Magika, another is the Ballet Studio Class, and another is the Black Theatre. All of these groups are artistically independent. They have their own artistic directors, but administratively they are run by the State Theatre Studio which is directly subsidized by the Ministry of Culture. Of course this is a specific situation in Prague, not in other towns.

Frankel: How long did the Theatre of the Rhinoceros last?

Lukes: The Theatre for the Rhinoceroses are still there, unfortunately. I am afraid that our National Theatre is for rhinoceroses. At least some of the performances are.

Frankel: Our Theatre of the Rhinoceros may be television. What opportunity during the development of this mass theatre was there for other dramatic experience?

Lukes: That is a good question. These two things are closely combined. As our television developed during the 1940’s, its social impact was negligible, but in the 1950’s and 1960’s, it became a Theatre for the Rhinoceros.

Wolf: As new theatres grow up in Prague, does the State Theatre Studio help them? Is it part of the Studio’s job to assist them to get subsidy and official recognition?

Lukes: Exactly.

Beckerman: Do I conclude from what you are describing the importance—or advisability—of a multiple type of theatre? Does the state recognize the necessity for a variety of types of theatres?

Lukes: That's right.

Frankel: A footnote to that point: audiences will take whatever an artist offers them. If an artist offers Rhinoceros Theatre, an audience is likely to respond to it. But an audience will always be more than equal to the best that an individual artists can do. An audience will always be better than the best of us individually can hope for.

Lukes: State support doesn't mean that theatre groups do not have to fight for their existence and their individuality. They have to.

Beckerman: What seems significant is that at the point where they demonstrated a validity, means were available for them to continue and to develop. In this country this is not necessarily the case—except perhaps in the Universities. In some cases the Universities do provide opportunity for development, but then it is highly institutionalized. We may have our rhinoceroses here. Is there a theatre of the rhinoceros in India?

Mitra: I am sure there are theatres of the rhinoceroses everywhere. You just can't avoid it. There are so many different theatres in India it would be difficult for me to describe the variety of forms and the variety of theatres we have. So far our state has not proved able to subsidize the theatre, although it wants to. We really do not have enough money. Now and then it has set up Academies—of Letters, of Fine Arts, and of Dance and Drama—and borne the cost. These are non-official bodies. There is a school of acting called The National School of Drama in New Delhi, and Universities have similar schools, but, so far as the living theatre is concerned, the government has not been able to do much. We hope that something will be done very soon, but the theatre has been running on its own because somehow, the people like it. When the Englishmen were there, we know it was difficult for them to support theatre. The theatre was a pulpit where you could speak very easily against the Establishment. They would rather have been applied to for a gilded theatre, and they passed laws which were horrible. Even then the theatre survived. It was only because the people liked the theatre. But the problem is the fight between the theatre that is "good" and the theatre that tries to express reality and involve people.

Naturally, as you try to create a theatre that is real, the techniques you develop are taken over by the commercial theatre which tells the lies that do not give you reality. The same thing happens when some propaganda group uses the techniques for didactic purposes that oversimplify. The moment you oversimplify, you give a wrong idea, a wrong picture of reality.

The important theatre has to fight against these things, because the moment they take over, the audience is polluted. You have to fight to keep your audience, to make them feel happy in the theatre, to feel a sensuous pleasure in theatre, and at the same time to have some sort of experience. These things have to be done together in our theatre, and if once the minds of the audience are polluted, you can't do it. Then a reaction sets in against the very theory of theatre-with-a-long-face which is—you know what it is!

When we try for this theatre which is related to reality and which wants to make people feel happy, glad, gay, joyous and at the same time experience something, we know we are connected with the dream of a society where people are living happily with each other, where there are no recriminations, where we

do not fight unnecessarily, do not spill blood—that sort of dream. Naturally in this work the theatre cannot be alone. We need Universities to help the minds of the young people as they grow up so that they do not go in for lies. We need the politicians also—not to concoct things to pollute the minds of the audience so that we cannot understand what reality is. It is an all-out thing, you know; it is not only for the theatre and of the theatre. It is for the whole of society. The whole society must change. Art to us is a weapon aiding us to understand reality and to fight against the bad dead leaves that may be there. As we fight, we need the help of Universities and political leaders to begin to do it.

When we try to do it in our country we have found that we cannot talk down to the audience. You cannot do that to the audience. You cannot feel that condescending attitude. That kills your art, kills you. For example, there was a horrible famine in our country in 1943, during the war. I think perhaps more people died in the streets in Bengal than were killed in the war. Such an astronomical figure! And we saw them die right in the streets. Now this was a point where a new movement in the theatre started, because at that point we felt that we could be as subtle as an artist can be, but at the same time be popular. The people understood it because it was something in which they were involved. When we brought the famine in, it was understood by everybody. I mean all grades, all levels of intellect were interested in that theatre. They could find something in the theatre. We didn't have to be easier for the audience. It is always true—in every country—that whenever there is something happening, something political perhaps, a center is found for the artist from which he can speak. He can be very subtle, he can be very artistic, and at the same time he can be understood by everybody in the country. I found that after these convulsions or political events, there is a section of the audience who go on demanding subtler things, important things. For myself I can say that I have not been able to meet the demands of the audience so far, so much as they want. I mean with as much subtlety or greatness as they want from us.

Beckerman: How do they manifest to you that they want it? By their behavior, by what they say?

Mitra: By their behavior.

Beckerman: By a sense by dissatisfaction, too?

Mitra: When we are able somehow to reach that point and see the expression of the people change, we know. I don't want to brag, but I have done many successful productions of the kind I mean in my life, and I have seen audiences reacting differently for different productions. Whenever we are able to reach the point, it is almost as if it gets away from time and space, and it becomes—should I be poetic?—almost a star. I have seen it happen every time. A very old mask, say of the Grecian or the Egyptian period, even now looks so alive because that moment was reached by the artist. Whether it is a smiling face or a laughing face, it looks so real, even today. Something happened. I don't know what, but something happened. The problem has been not to make the theatre for the many. Theatre I know is not a mass medium. But at the same time it is in part a mass medium because so many people come to see the theatre. It goes on; it may run for years. What happens is that there is a contact point between these two that can be reached only when all the different factors of the society work for the

same goals. You cannot put on a play that is important when at the same time you have the politicians lying every day and when those things are happening that are being reported in the newspapers. It just cannot happen. All these things have to be taken together as part of peoples' lives.

Ferenc Hont Describes Censorship and Artistic Freedom in Hungary

Hont: In Hungary and in Czechoslovakia, the responsibility between the theatre and society and the government lies with the artistic director of the theatre. He makes the program; he is responsible because he has the control.

It is not a control delegated to other directors of the theatre. By himself, the artistic director is responsible. In Hungary, censorship is forbidden by law. There is no censorship. By law, in the constitution, there are two prohibitions on theatre, and on film and writing: You cannot make propaganda for war or for racism. Artists *can* make such statements, but afterward, they would come before the courts.

In other areas, it is the artistic director who is responsible, and who is free and can do what he wants. He has liberty, and at the same time, responsibility toward society. . . .

We have a small satiric theatre which plays satiric sketches concerning life, society, etc. It even attacks the government. The first minister two years ago went to this little theatre, and on the stage anecdotes were told against him. After the performance, he went into the foyer, and appeared to be very serious. The actors said to themselves, "Now what will he think to say?" One asked him whether he was satisfied. He said, "No, I was not satisfied because these anecdotes against me were not sharp enough. For me and for your government, it would be better not to attack me on the stage by anecdotes, but to come to the table and say it."

It is necessary for all theatres to have liberty, and at the same time to assume a responsibility which is both artistic and ethical.

From Group III: Developing and Improving Artistic Leadership

The Sense of the Ghetto in American Negro Theatre, a debate between Mr. Edmonds, M. Darcante, Mr. Gister, Mr. Alkazi, and Mr. Beltzer.

Beltzer: The question of developing artistic leadership in connection with the Negro in American theatre is important at this time. If the foreign delegates consider their experiences in the New York theatre last week, they will realize that there were very few Negroes in the audience. Why is this so? When plays are produced in which there is a famous Negro star or in which there are Negro themes, the Negroes do come to the theatre. But why don't they come to see other plays? Is it because they are not trained, culturally? Or is it because the plays are not of interest or not pertinent to them? Currently in New York, there is one play, *Hallelujah, Baby*, which is about the Negro in twentieth century America. But in the audience for *The Homecoming*, you can count on two hands the number of Negroes in the audience of 1300. Why? Shouldn't *The Homecoming* appeal to the American Negro? Is it of limited concept?

Edmonds: The American Negro's reaction to the theatre is the same as that of any other people. There were six centuries of development in England before Shakespeare. Negroes have been free only one century. Most Negroes have come from the South which is just beginning to be a real theatrical region. It's a matter of building an audience. I think that amateur theatres can begin to build audiences for professional theatres. It is not going to take 600 years to do it, but it is going to take longer than a century.

In the beginning of the American theatre, all the plays people would go to see came from England. They wouldn't go to see American theatre. Mr. Adedeji's audiences are doing the same thing. Out of seventy productions, three are by Nigerians. This is what the Americans did when they started out. American playwrights didn't get a hearing. You have to have time to develop. Mr. Adedeji's people are not going to flock to see Nigerian plays any more than Americans flocked to see American plays in the beginnings. In building an audience, we work within limitations. Drama is a fettered art, more limited than any other.

Darcante (paraphrased): I am angry at what I hear. You speak of history—of 100 years of civilization, but you are speaking only of the Occidental theatre. The Negro does not need the Occidental civilization to understand theatre! He has been an admirable audience for centuries. It is a sickness to say that theatre begins with Shakespeare and Molière! It is a sickness to say that the Negro is not an audience!

Edmonds: You have to work in category. The Africans and the American Negro have had separate environments. Of course the Africans have a theatre, but 100 years ago the American Negro lived in a section that had none. They are behind even the Southerners who were free to go to the theatre. Environment determines whether people like theatres or not—in any country, any culture. We haven't had the environment.

Gister: Certainly the theatre has not been as accessible in this country to the Negro as to the Caucasians. The question is not whether the Negro responds to

The Homecoming as opposed to any other kind of play. It has to do with what he wants to pay his three or four dollars to see. I think he would probably prefer to see Sammy Davis more than Carol Channing. But there are Caucasians who would prefer Carol Channing to anybody else. There are movements afoot in this country to bring theatre at a popular price to people to whom theatre has not been accessible. A group of my students have organized themselves into a performing group for the summer. They are going to West Virginia to perform in hospitals, prisons, mental institutions and even on city squares where anyone can come to see them. There will be no charge, and they are doing this at their own cost. We need more of this if we are to develop audiences, no matter what their race.

Alkazi: I'm sorry, Professor Gister. I don't agree with you. If the American Negroes do not go to *The Homecoming* it is because *The Homecoming* has nothing to say to them. If they go to see *Hallelujah, Baby*, it is because the play affects their own experiences, their sensibilities. I think it is necessary for the American Negro to develop his own type of theatre, which has nothing to do, really, with the Western theatre, instead of constantly feeling an inferiority—a feeling of being backward or behind the times in relation to the Occidental theatre. I think the American Negro theatre should develop on a different tack altogether. It needs to reject a great deal which is false and purely snobbish in what the theatre has to offer. A great deal of the Broadway and Off-Broadway theatre is snobbish.

Edmonds: I wouldn't agree with that at all. Americans are hyphenated Americans. There are Irish-Americans, Jewish-Americans, Italian-Americans, Polish-Americans, Negro-Americans. We are not ethnically one people. I don't see why an Irishman has to stick to an Irish theatre and develop that and reject everything else. He's an American; he should enjoy American theatre. And I can't understand why Negroes can't appreciate what's going on in Africa and appreciate *The Homecoming*, too. And he *will* appreciate *The Homecoming*, just as soon as it's accessible. But now you have to pay from five to ten dollars a ticket to go to it. Negroes don't make that kind of money. He might spend it on beer, but not on *The Homecoming*. Going to the theatre is a habit. But I would hesitate to go to the theatre when I needed ten dollars to buy some shoes. That's the way it is.

The American environment is getting confused as to these things, however. Certainly projects like the one Mr. Gister described will bring in larger audiences, both white and colored. Many of the miners in West Virginia, white or colored, have never seen a live play before. Why should they pay ten dollars for something they have never experienced. The hyphenated Americans, all of us, have got to understand and appreciate *our* background, here, in America.

Gister: The point is that it behooves any artistic leader to try to develop a theatre for the people. And the people are many thing and require many different things. Each needs to see something that satisfies an inner need on his part. I am not sure we can develop a theatre for the Negro or for any other group unless it comes out of the group. Before that can happen, we must make the theatre accessible to them, so that they can get engaged in the theatre and create something for themselves.

Beltzer: The Negro high schools of Harlem produced school plays with Negro casts and in a sense educated their students to certain aspects of theatre. They have experiences with American drama, just as white students have. They can buy tickets for two dollars. But the point is that they do not go to the theatre in New York because they have no sense of belonging to it. They do not go unless there is a sense of the ghetto within the theatre whether it is on Broadway or off, or in Harlem.

*A Theatre for the 5000-Year-Ago Woman:
a soliloquy by Mr. Alkazi*

Alkazi: As you probably know, I had the greater part of my theatrical training in the Western theatre. I was trained in England, and afterward I returned to India in order to work in the theatre in my country. Even before I left for England, the problem that had been in the forefront of my mind was how to relate this experience to the situation in my country. I worked for fifteen years in the theatre in a cosmopolitan city like Bombay, which is faced with the same type of problems and situations which exist in the West, but only on the surface. That theatre only reached a certain level of society, and I was always miserable and unhappy about the work I did there because I felt that it did not really relate to the life of the Indian people as a whole.

Therefore my business was to try to discover what form of theatrical experience could reach those millions of people who live in the villages, and who spend their lives on the pavements of the cities. The most sobering influence was when I was put in charge of the National School of Drama at Delhi. I was cast from a cosmopolitan city like Bombay to a city which was really in the very heart, and which reflected the very soul of my country. Suddenly for the first time I came across students who came from villages and from small towns. (As you know our country is really a country of villages; we have 700,000 villages.) I was suddenly confronted by life literally lived in the raw. There are many terrifying experiences I could relate to you about the day-to-day life of these individuals, experiences which then had to be transformed into art.

While I had ideas in my head as to what kind of course to work out for these students, I found that I could achieve my understanding of the theatre only by walking through the streets, by going into the back streets and into the lanes, by discovering the life that my students lived amongst the gutters, and by trying to understand what kind of inner experience went on in their lives and asking how theatrical performance in modern buildings with modern facilities related to this interior life.

One of the things that occurred to me was that here the place of theatre in society was very valid, very non-artificial, very genuine. Theatre exists in the daily life of the people. We have certain festivals throughout the year which act as a climax to daily experience. A festival like *Dasara*, which celebrates the return of Rama from exile and which is also the soul discovering itself, as it were, through the journeys of Rama through the dark night of the soul. We have a festival like *Holi*, which is a festival of colors providing a kaleidoscope of human experience, and we have a festival like *Diwali*, which is a festival of lights.

Now as I began to understand theatre, I began to feel and appreciate that these are also essentially theatrical experiences. One of the most stimulating things happened when the East-West seminar was held in New Delhi. The delegates from the West for the first time came across this kind of theatrical experience being lived out in the streets. They were overwhelmed by it and said that if there is any form of social theatre, this is it. At one time at the confluence of the Ganges, you have one million people attending from different parts of the country, immersing themselves in the river and then watching for a period of from ten to fifteen days a rite like the moralities and the mysteries of medieval times. This is a crucial experience which takes place in the lives of individuals, and which transforms the people as a whole.

This kind of experience was something which I felt had to be brought into the scope of study of the National School of Drama. These were living myths, and my problem was to discover the kind of theatrical language which could express them. How is it possible to relate the performances on the stage with the subterranean, interior life of our people? And another problem: how do we distinguish dead forms? Some of these myths had ossified—had been reduced to empty ritual, superstition, cant, sometimes even to hypocrisy. How could we distinguish them and how could we tap the living sap of this ancient tree? Then how could we relate all this to contemporary life? How could we understand its validity to the contemporary experience of India?

Looking out of the window of the National School of Drama, you see a woman at work on a new modern building, rising ten or fifteen floors. She carries stones on her head with her child strapped to her back, helping to set up a modern structure which will present within its walls a theatrical experience. In what way is the experience related to her? You find a 5000-year-old woman, holding a transistor in her hand, and suddenly time and space have acquired a completely different meaning. Unless I can take into the experience of the theatre this new concept of time and space and this new concept of experience, I cannot talk to that 5000-year-old woman.

These are some of the problems I have. In the three-year course at the National School of Drama, what kind of experience can I communicate to the students who come from different parts of the country? What dramatic literature shall we teach them? And at what level? We teach the literature of classical Indian drama and of classical Western drama from the Greeks to the present, and we teach contemporary Indian drama. We try to teach them the relationship of dramatic literature to the changing forms and meanings of theatre reflected in theatre technique, scene and costume design, lighting, make-up and theatre architecture, so that they understand the relationship between the form of a building to the experience that is live within it. We have also, fortunately, a very vigorous and powerful folk theatre. We have allowed the conventions of the classical Indian theatre to filter through and to permeate the country as a whole in a poetic and imaginative manner.

. . .

I think that most schools of drama have been barking up the wrong tree because they have been trying to provide technically qualified personnel to feed an industry. We all say the theatre is sick, that the professional theatre is by

and large corrupt, that it is a mockery only occasionally sustained by the glimmering of genius. By and large we seem to be equipping young people with their idealism and their imagination, only so that they may be corrupted by the professional theatre as it exists in most of the countries of the world. Those who have served the theatre most significantly have been invariably those who have turned their back on theatre—people like Craig, like Appia, like Jacques Copeau in France. They sensed in the theatre the seed of corruption. Just as a religion is corrupted into superstition or into promiscuity, similarly there are seeds of corruption in the very nature of theatre. The cult of the personality, the exposure and the exploitation of the individual, the cult of success, the inability of human beings to understand the ephemeral nature of the theatre and the dignity of the ephemeral moment on the stage.

Ultimately all schools of art lead to the art of life, to the art of living. Unless we can understand how life is transformed into art and how it is vitalized by art—unless we can understand this two-way process so that art is not merely something that is talked about in school or gathered together in libraries or set upon the walls of museums—unless art can permeate and inform every moment of our basic day-to-day living, it cannot become valid experience.

I think perhaps for that reason we turn again and again with a sense of wonder and enchantment to the living experience of the art in Japan. We see how art can form a simple little thing like the Tea Ceremony. However interesting it may be for tourists and visitors to Japan, it is an important part of the ritual and philosophy.

Art as we all know is not statically developed. It changes, and it is the business of a school of drama to be sensitive to these changes. They are brought about by creative individuals in the theatre, and it is necessary to be constantly in touch with creative people in other fields—with painters, sculptors, and musicians, and we must relate the experiences we are trying to portray in the theatre to the experience these people are sensing about them and expressing in their works of art.

When we talk about artistic leadership, it is not something which is established by fiat. An artist gains respect not by fiat but by the quality of his work. His artistic leadership does not come from his position of eminence or the significance of his salary, but through the quality of his work and through its meaning to the large masses of people—through its capacity to affect life for the audience. An artist is a visionary, a revealer, a discoverer of new forms. So is the theatre, and so is the teacher in the theatre a visionary. I do not think there can be a teacher who is merely a pedagogue and who is not really a creative artist.

One of the important things is to be able to communicate to the student the arduousness of the discipline required in the theatre. We must show him that this art is not something which welcomes. The muses in the theatre are absolutely pitiless. They do not welcome the would-be initiate with open arms. As Cocteau so brilliantly said, "They stand indifferently at the door, and they point silently at the tight-rope." The anonymity, the egolessness of a true artist is extremely important. But the cult of personality has destroyed the art of the theatre. The teacher in the theatre should be a person who slowly moves, initiates and then withdraws. He should work through students with their ex-

periences and allow them—as the Japanese doctor has said—to ride upon his shoulders so that he is able to see beyond what the teacher himself has been able to see. The process of teaching is initiation and withdrawal. But unless the teacher has been able to establish a *rappport*, a sense of tremendous affection and love, I don't think a valid artistic experience can be communicated. We talk all the time about educating the masses, educating our audiences. Believe me, as far as my country is concerned, I have received all my education from the common people. There is very little really that I can teach them. The skills, the qualities of imagination which are expressed in the very manner in which they wash their clothes or order their homes—although they may be living in the huts of primitive man, in the state of a cave man—the manner in which they create symbols of sheer beauty in their day-to-day life is a lesson to me of utter humility. And also of the purposelessness, ultimately, of art.

I think too much significance is given to Art with a capital "A." Art is an essence. It exists not in artifacts, not in objects but in the permeation—in people, in a climate, and in an experience. I think that unless we go to that experience, it's useless.

I spoke to you of the brutality and the fear in which some of us live. I give you an example of a student who asked to go home. I am very strict about these matters and said, "No. You can't."

He said that it was a very serious matter so I allowed him leave. When he returned I asked him what was the trouble.

He said, "My grandfather became mad, got a fit of lunacy, and he had to be taken to the lunatic asylum. We tied him up, and we took him by bus, and he started screaming and shouting on the bus. When we got off the bus, we realized we had to walk a distance of ten or twelve miles. So we put a halter on his neck, and we pulled him, and we pushed him, and we goaded him, and we battered him, and we threw stones at him. And he was then taken and incarcerated into that lunatic asylum."

I said, "Well, what does this experience really mean to you—this terrifying experience?"

He said, "You know, I remembered Lucky in *Waiting for Godot*. For me, my grandfather was really Lucky. He screamed and we gagged him. But he was a man who was trying to express the pain of an inner experience which is too terrifying for me to bear. He was like Artaud's actor signalling through the flames signs that were too terrifying to decipher. And therefore now we have put him aside."

There are other terrifying experiences, like that of a student from Kashmir who came to me one day and said, "I must go back to Kashmir because I have had very bad news from home."

I allowed him to go. He came back a week later and I said, "I hope everything is all right."

He said, "No, my sister died."

I said, "What do you mean?"

He said, "Well, this was my sister-in-law. My brother stabbed her seventeen times and she died."

I said, "Well, what do you do now?"

And he said, "Oedipus went through worse things."

It's fantastic that students who come from the most backward villages, who in terms of Western education are really backward in terms of their material acquisitions, are able to project a relationship between something that they experience in the pages of a book and something which is immediately seen by them in life. And to be able to rise above this! Therefore, it is because of experiences such as this that I have a tremendous amount of respect and regard for the theatre, for the students in India, for the masses in India and for the future of the theatre in my country.

From Group V: Improving Design for the Theatrical Function

Theatre and Variations: an ardent dialogue between Messrs. Schechner, Tovstonogov, Spaic, Hoffman, and Gaiser.

Schechner: During this longest coffee break in conference history, I had an interesting discussion with one of the State Department translators. We were talking about *America, Hurrah!*, a production growing out of the Open Theatre in New York. The third play, *Motel*, has much to say both negatively and positively about the uses of scenery and the place of a certain kind of environment. In *Motel*, three large dolls come into a room which is a caricature of an American Midwestern motel for some kind of assignation. Perhaps they are travelers on the road who are tired and wish a place to stay for the night; perhaps they are adulterers who wish a place in which to consummate their adultery; perhaps they are simple lovers who move from motel to motel. At any rate, they come into the motel and proceed to destroy it. They bounce on the bed and rip it apart; they flush the toilet and break it; they crash down props and demolish the entire room. The only dialogue in the play is a monologue spoken by the keeper of the motel and broadcast to the audience by tape recording.

The interesting fact about *Motel* is not that the dolls destroy the motel, but the implicit and, I think, very clear scenically presented fact that the environment destroys the characters: that in this play, at least, some of what Artaud spoke about—that the stage is a concrete space to be filled, that props and scenery have a life—is realized. One has to ask why the dirty words are scribbled on the wall, why the bed is bounced upon and broken, what enrages these people without their knowing that they are being enraged. Certainly here is a frustration with the environment, and they mount an almost defensive attack on the motel which has, in the process of the play, attacked them. The action makes clear and concrete the dehumanization of people who run motels, and of motels themselves—even of architecture somewhat like that of this room which tends to deny our individuality. Here the only visual scenic element is a grille work, functionally correct but still rather bizarre, with six faces [*the translators*] staring at us from behind glass walls, as if we were some kind of controlled experiment they were monitoring.

The translator and I were discussing the motel environment—not this one—and he says it did not upset him in any way—that he found it functional and pleasant. He said that he found the Hilton Hotel in Paris the most pleasant building there. His point of view and that of the play represent two kinds of consciousness towards environment. The first says environment should be anonymous and functional: this room is air-conditioned, the table is comfortable, the chairs are pleasant, the translators do good work and we can communicate. Therefore the room satisfies all functions we might desire in an environment. But another developing consciousness holds that an environment is not enough if it merely serves certain utilitarian functions—that an environment cannot be anonymous but that it always impinges on those who live within its environs.

Therefore, an environment, like a person, has personality and that even a so-called anonymous environment will have its effect, positively or negatively, on those existing within it.

The simple recognition of what I consider a simple fact indicates, at least to me, the desirability of certain basic changes in our treatment of scenography and of environment. If we shift our assumption and say that a place cannot be anonymous or neutral but must have an active personality, then we begin to operate along a whole spectrum of possible actions for environment. It ceases to be a simple enclosing space, but becomes a fluid transformational set of subjective conditions and attitudes which, particularly in the theatre, can become as important as any other character in the play, and perhaps more important than most. One begins to ask even of classic texts certain important questions. When Chekov (or perhaps it was Stanislavski) said that to participate in *The Three Sisters* is to visit the house of the Prozorovs, one has to ask "How does this house condition the action of the Prozorovs? In what sense is the house the most important character in the play?" The play becomes not simply the battle for the possession of the house, as we have classically looked at it, but the battle of the house to possess those within it. The latter is perhaps equally important, perhaps more important than the classic view, and the play becomes not so much a struggle between Natasha and the sisters over the house, but a struggle of the house, to say whom it will accept, whom it wants more, and whom it will expell.

I think the concept begins to open real possibilities for re-examining classic texts and the relationship between their setting and their action. There is a basic tension growing between what I would call "evolutionary logic" and "transformational logic." Mr. Elder stated this morning that space must be determined, planned and evolved. This notion of one event growing out of another is "evolutionary logic," Aristotelian, classic, and very normal for most of us to use. "Transformational logic" is more related to Artaud and can include sudden, non-logically-connected changes and shifts. We understand very well what we mean by evolution, and "evolutionary logic" and evolutionary scenery, and scenography which relates harmonically to the action of a play. I think we are just beginning to grasp what we mean by transformational logic and transformational scenery, and action. If evolution is related to the acorn which grows into the oak, and one stage inevitably follows from another, then transformation is more related to games, in which there is a simple set of rules within whose structures there is a great deal of room for sudden changes and reversals—of one thing *not* following from another, of a thing occurring on top of another and simultaneously with another. If the acting exercise of evolution is *improvisation*, then the acting exercise of transformation is *game*.

It is difficult in a brief time to explain exactly what I mean by "games," but let me say that it is much like mathematics and that the logic of games is perhaps a cold logic when compared to the logic of evolution. Games are like mathematics in that you accept a basic set of rules, and then explore all the permutations possible within those rules. It is unlike mathematics in this one sense: that you can break the rules at certain points and in breaking the rules of one game, you immediately start another.

In *Motel*, as the characters change suddenly, as the setting becomes an active participant in the play, a certain game—the game of conventional theatre in which the setting is anonymous and passive to a certain degree—is broken, and a new game begins. The play creates a tension between our expectations derived from the old, organic game and what we see on the stage. By means of this tension, the play really captures our interest, but otherwise it is not so complicated, nor so great as a work by Chekov or Brecht. It is only in that disappointment of expectation and release of new expectation that we find something new and exciting in the production.

We are not talking here of whether art is great or not, but simply whether an event achieves the status of art. Greatness is something about which only long historical consideration can render an intelligent verdict. To judge a work great in its own time is always polemical, but I think we can make certain determinations of whether something is artistic or not—whether it be good or bad. Earlier Mr. Elder gave a classical evolutionary definition of art as “that in which the artist or group of artists have made choices.” He asked me whether some of the things I feel strongly about, such as “intermedia,” games, happenings, environmental theatre involved choices. There are choices involved, but they are of a different sort in the transformational kind of theatre.

Let me describe a Happening that I and two colleagues did last year in order to show you what I mean by choice. It was called *466* and it was staged in a large room in which there were about 120 audience members, many of whom participated during parts of the night. In the room, we showed all kinds of variations on the basic themes of earth and air with films, with opaque projectors that could project textures, with *musique concrete*, and more importantly, by having the audience participate in dealing with earth and air—carrying pails of dirt, digging, blowing up balloons, and so on.

We made none of those final choices that are made in theatrical production, but we did know before hand exactly what the audience would make use of and what they would not. Each minute of that production was plotted in a scenario—a sheet six feet long in which every minute had a number, from 1 to 120 and eleven elements deep, ranging from five performer groups and the varieties of technical equipment to the audience itself as one of the performing elements. We knew at each minute what each group would be working with, what films we'd be showing at what minute, and so on. But there were certain times when there was a gap in the structure, as, for example, minutes 15 and 26, when nothing was planned. At these times the audience could do what it pleased, the projectionists could show their movies or not as they pleased, the people running sound could do what they wished, and then they returned to the prepared scenario. In other words, we did set up a rather complicated game in which there were rules, but it was like an athletic event because part of the game was to obtain goals within those rules by outwitting those opposing you.

Therefore there were definite choices to be made by performers and audience and technicians at each moment as to how to obtain his goal. However, unlike a normal theatrical production, we did not give him the route. In a normal theatre, you simply give the blocking: you want to get from here to that chair, and you take a long rehearsal to make that cross effective, to structure that move. In

the other kind of choice, you say that you want to get to that chair, but you cannot walk in that area which is off limits until you see how the audience comes in. Your objective is still to get to that chair, but each night you will have to do it differently, because you will be presented with a different situation. The director, the creator of the *mise-en-scène* has the choice of setting what rules he wishes and the performer and the audience have a variety of choices in organizing their own activities within those rules. The creator of the *mise-en-scène* is moved into a unique position as one who establishes convention. In the conventional theatre, we accept the conventions and develop the strategy to move through. In game theatre, or environmental theatre, or happenings, you establish the conventions and throw onto the performer and the audience the usual work of the director of seeing how, within those conventions, certain objectives can be achieved.

I have been very sketchy in explaining some of these essential and, I think, basic changes. I love the conventional theatre—the traditional theatre. I like to work in it, I like to see it, and I do not feel in any sense that these two things are contradictory or mutually exclusive. But I do believe that this other kind of theatre is also a possibility for professionals to work in, to explore, to move with, to get something out of. And I fully see the two co-existing, if not peacefully, at least productively with each other.

Toustonogov: It is probably very important to experience these sensory perceptions which have been described. Otherwise it is difficult to talk about them. From what I have heard, I must say that I am not at all sure that there was a great deal of talent involved, although judging from Mr. Schechner's own presentation, it is clear that he has plenty of talent. I wonder, however, if this talent is being displayed in the right way: I really have a serious question in that respect.

It seems to me my Yugoslavian colleague displayed a good deal of liberalism in this matter, but I would take a rather more reserved attitude. In fact I would even protest rather violently against this sort of thing. Any type of innovation can be very acute, very sharply displayed—as was said with respect to Shakespeare or the people who preceded him, or with respect to abstract art when compared with earlier art forms. But in any type of revolutionary movement, the nature or essence of the phenomena should not be affected. Take soccer, for example. It is possible to improve the technique of soccer. It *has* improved in many respects in the last fifty years. But suppose you had five goals and gave each player a ball of his own. It wouldn't be soccer any longer; it would be something else again. Or take the piano: you can improve the proficiency of a player to the point where he becomes a virtuoso. We all know that the pianists today, if you compare them to those of several decades ago, have really improved. Compare the way Chopin was performed by Hoffman a couple of decades ago and the way he is performed by Richter today. It is quite a difference, a tremendous improvement in the performance of Chopin. But on the other hand, you could take the piano and change its nature by adding a certain amount of electronic devices and achieve an entirely different sort of performance and different form of art. This is the essence of the question in my mind. To me, the great thing about the theatre—what magnetizes and galvanizes the observer

—are the performances which give the observer important ideas about important problems. This is what is important about theatre, and if we kill off all of this the whole intellectual content of theatre disappears. It's not a question of who pisses and who doesn't in the theatre. This sort of activity in the theatre deflects me from being able to absorb its artistic content.

It's very difficult, as I have said, to judge something which one hasn't seen with one's eyes, but from what I have comprehended here, I not only do not agree to it, I am spiritually in violent protest against this sort of thing. What you have described as "traditional theatre" is theatre itself. What you are advocating, while it may have some elements of "traditional theatre" in it is really anti-theatre. It is a thing which is against the very nature of theatre, opposed to everything for which I have been working all these years. I apologize for being so sincere about it, but I am concerned about everything which relates to theatrical art. I am surprised. I talked privately with Mr. Schechner yesterday, and I could see that he has a great deal of subtlety, a great deal of interest and understanding of Chekov. How can these qualities be combined with what he has just been describing about his happenings? He is almost a schizophrenic here. He has mutually exclusive personalities. They definitely exclude one another!

It is incomprehensible to me that this can be some new type of theatre. In all historical times there have been forward movements. They have been revolutionary at times but there have also been various extremes which did not develop further, which seemed genius but were dead ends. I had a theme which I wanted to discuss today: the relationship between space and time and the relationship of both to the play. But what I've heard just now has completely deflected me from the desire to talk about this. These phenomena are subject to entirely different laws, and for me to discuss the subject you have raised as pertaining to the traditional theatre is impossible. I can hardly express my sharply negative attitude toward what I have just heard. I would like to see such a thing as this in order to be absolutely sure whether I really do reject it to the extent I think I do, or to find out whether it contains some materials which might be acceptable.

Gaiser: I think in the interests of accurate observation and reporting, I should indicate my prejudices which in some ways are harmonious with those of Mr. Tovstonogov. I think what Mr. Schechner would have to face is the question of whether or not one can assemble fully trained, imaginative people of the professional theatre and get them to engage in this material. On the other hand, it does seem to me that this is a kind of theatre made for the visual artist and the musician. The challenge can be great, the materials available are wide, and the effects that can be achieved are impressive by any standard of visual art. If a new kind of theatre—a scenographic theatre—appears, the major question to me is the role of theatrical acting. I think Mr. Schechner's description perhaps gives undue emphasis to one side of the movement. There are others, like myself, who seek a new kind of theatre that does not use a text but does want to use the human body and seek what we have been seeking for fifty years in the theatre—the kind of comprehensive performer who can sing, dance, mimic, parody, create his own script. Such work has frequently been an auxiliary of the traditional theatre. The Chauve-Souris activities of the Moscow Art Theatre we

have heard about. Whether they were any good or not, I don't know. But I think that anyone using modern acting training techniques also winds up at times using a cabaret set of techniques, if only to free the actor for more serious work.

Hoffman: Gary, the crux, it seems to me, lies in the fact that even where you have performers who have artistic abilities, so long as you are asking for a random response, it is difficult to get artistry. Artistry depends very much on technique and skill and a practiced use of what you have. It may well be that this could be developed eventually, as the actors of the *Commedia del' arte*, training over the years, and building a tradition, also developed an art in their own right. You can get to some level of perfection, but as it is now, as I have observed it, it is hardly artistic.

Spaic: You mention the word "technique." In established music, painting, theatre, there is technique which helps us to judge the result. Here is something new. We do not yet understand its techniques. We don't have it yet, we don't know what it is. So I personally would not dare to say in advance, "Banish it," or say it has nothing to do. Composers who started in conservatories writing fugues and counterpoint have been trained for *musique concrète*. I am watching this development, and see that talent cannot be judged by the measurements we have formerly established. It is an exploration; it is a new field you are opening. I would not dare to be "positive" in my negative statements about this. There is the same thing in painting. Picasso opened a completely new era of painting. If you judge him by Raphael or Cézanne, he is not a good painter. It may be that in the theatre the same thing is happening.

I have not seen this theatre, so I do not know. Yet it may be that an absolutely new experience can grow out of it. In the classic theatre, there is the stage and the audience. Something happens on the stage and the audience comes and enjoys it or does not enjoy it. The participation of the audience is different in the theatre and in the happening or whatever it is—I wouldn't call it theatre—that Mr. Schechner explained to us. Why call it theatre? It is something different, social. Something is happening. We have "anti-drama," if the word exists. Ionesco, who is established today, wrote anti-drama. His whole work was a revolution against plays with a story. So we know what it is. Today Ionesco is accepted by the middle class. It can happen with John Cage. This cat, like some painters, is snobbish. It is what the French would say "*pour épater le bourgeois*." I believe that Mr. Schechner and many others are very honest. They are not doing it only "*pour épater le bourgeois*," or to be snobbish. They are trying to find a new way—not of theatre. We have to find another word, because when we say "theatre" we immediately think in terms of a written play and an audience who is participating in a passive way. In this other form, the participation of the audience is more active. There is no division of actor and audience. The audience becomes the actor.

To me the most important question is what this new form means today. What does it mean for a contemporary man, a man of the electronic era where we started this whole thing? What does it really mean? Is it a picture of the so-called "alienated man?" I do not know, and I would ask Mr. Schechner what it means. No. I cannot find the right word. I don't mean "meaning" in the sense

of message, or whatever, but in the sense of "Why do you have the need?" You are no longer satisfied with a classical production? Why do you need to find new words, new sounds? You cannot play on the violin any longer. You have to find a new instrument. Now tell me why.

Schechner: I want to answer and to speak to my new and good friend Mr. Tovstonogov and to answer Mr. Spaic's question also. Let me do it first by describing the final scene of *Victims of Duty*.

[The tape at this point is indecipherable at several moments. Mr. Schechner described a production on which he worked as a director in which the action not only took place on stage but was photographed by a television cameraman walking on the stage and projected on a T.V. set which the actors were watching. The audience can see action both on stage and on television. Schechner continues:]

This in some way seemed to represent much of what goes on in the modern situation, where one is both participant and observer. It gave to the audience the terrifying sense of events occurring in their homes and outside their homes at the same time. It is not *alienation* that this new theatre tries for. It is more *celebration*. Horrible things can be celebrated as well as pleasant. Alienation to me means fleeing *from* the event. Celebration means participation *in* the event. It is a significant difference. The Theatre of the Absurd to me means largely an avoidance of necessary confrontations and the reduction of that avoidance to farce. This kind of theatre means to me the complete involvement in these events, whether they be pleasant or unpleasant, confrontation of these events. So I call them "participatory" and "celebratory," to answer *you*. [Spaic]

To Mr. Tovstonogov, I would like to say, first, that I would love to see a man of your talent and sensitivity working, or at least experimenting in this. When you call me a schizophrenic, you are right. I cannot separate my love for Chekov and Shakespeare and Aeschylus and my sensitivity to their theatre and my love for this. I find it not particularly difficult, however, to entertain two contradictory tendencies in my mind at the same time. I would hope that as you think about some of these techniques you too will become schizophrenic.

You are right when you say that at its extremes it is not theatre. *Happening 466* is not theatre; it is a performance event. It has much in common with sports. But when we move back toward environmental theatre—as for instance in *Victims of Duty*, where we brought closed-circuit TV within the action of the play—then I think we are talking about theatre. We are talking about the possibilities of exploring even the classic texts by integrating modern technology into them. I think there is a spectrum here which moves into music, painting and visual environment and non-theatre. I would not in any sense call it "anti-theatre." I don't like the word "anti." It happens to be its own form. It is not opposed to theatre and it is not against theatre. It is different from theatre. It is no more "anti-theatre" than music is "anti-theatre" or than supper is "anti-theatre." It is different from theatre. As we move toward its center, toward environmental productions using scripts, using texts, we are into a variation of classic theatre. I think we must get away from the thought that things must oppose things, that things must contradict things, that things must eliminate or battle with things. They are set apart, at certain extremes. But they are not *against*.

As for Mr. Hoffman's question as to whether this kind of theatre can attract superb actors, I don't know. Surely it needs superb actors. . . . Perhaps some of Mr. Hoffman's finest acting talent would be willing at least to experiment in this line. I don't think we are going to have trouble finding fine performers, but I do think it's important that theatre people, like Mr. Tovstonogov, at least, recognize the possibilities in this. If we are to attract fine talent, the talent must at least admit the possibility. At least don't describe it as "anti-theatre," but as something that is perhaps possible, that perhaps can be used. I think we are at an age where this kind of experimentation, or exploration is extraordinarily useful, both for what it may yield for classic texts or for what it may yield in the new art form—as the symphony became an art form, or the novel. At this time we have to be very careful in not making critical judgments. I am not so sure it's a new art form, but it may be a very serious variation on theatre. I no longer call theatre "theatre" but "performance." I think semantic problems can really get in the way of our doing particular works. Some of this lies clearly within theatre; some seems clearly outside. But that to me seems irrelevant in getting involved in particular experiments, whatever we may call them.

Technology, the Actor and the Word

Schechner: It was easy for the theatre to use electricity when it was introduced at the end of the Nineteenth Century because everyone wanted light and there were reasons to perform at night. Today, there are other means of technology available which the theatre hasn't used, from three-dimensional photography to really sophisticated TV and film projections. I'm not urging that it be used, but I think it is a basic problem of whether the technological breakthroughs of the 40's and 50's are to be integrated into the theatre or not, or whether the theatre is to renounce the use of this technology. I think that's at the heart of some of our issues.

Baker: I would like to suggest that the contemporary attitude toward the use of technical materials is no longer separate from the center as it formerly was when we thought of a set behind the actor and lights were "put in" as illumination. But it seems to me that the contemporary attitude is that all of these elements, when they are really used correctly, are used in the same way that actors are. You work with these as an instrument which is as sensitive, as delicate—and which takes as much creativity—as anything else. Lighting, sound, movie camera, projections—any of these things are not added on top of the actor, but are extensions of him. The theatre architecture which allows that to happen easily and well and the director who adopts that attitude, are moving into the world of our present theatre where all elements become a creative instrument for communication.

Gaiser: I was going to say exactly the same thing—that we need to divide the technical devices of the past from today's devices, and say that those of the past are no more than backgrounds, while today's devices are actually part of the communication.

Baker: When you use them as you use an actor, then you develop a creative whole which dictates the kind of theatre you want, the kind of space you want

to work in. If the space is flexible enough so that you can choose what you want for your various statements, then it is right.

. . .

Hoffman: The basic question I asked was whether the artistic power of design is enhanced by modern technology, or does technology in itself tend to take over the conventional work of the director?

Spaic: Take sound as an example. I have often felt that we use too much mechanical sound. The voice of the actor has been, until now, happily natural. On TV, no. But TV is a mechanical reproduction, and there the sound is technical, mechanical, in itself. When an actor is playing normally, and there has to be the sound of an auto, let us say, I don't like the taped sound of an auto. The realistic reproduction of an auto sound on tape is more a TV than a theatre technique. It is more film than theatre.

Schechner: What would you think of using the technical elements, not to reinforce the actor's reality—to let the actor create his reality completely—but to create a technical reality, which is entirely different? For example, we did an English production of Ionesco's *Victimes de Devoir*, which is extraordinarily lyrical in the French text, for an audience that did not wholly understand French. And at several points in the play, while the actor was doing his best with the English text, over the speaker system we ran the French text, previously recorded by a French actor, at a lower volume than the voice of the actor on stage, but still audible enough for those in the audience who spoke French to understand. This technique gave a kind of depth to the dialogue which could only have been available through technology. It didn't reinforce the English text in any sense, but it presented its own technical reality, as it were. And perhaps films could be used, also, not to fix the setting, but, as Grotowski did—if he used films, as he says, to contradict—to add a completely explosive, contradictory or amplifying element.

Vessey: It is difficult to say. You don't make the medium a purpose in itself. It can be used, of course. We do. Everybody does. But with precaution. I have always felt that the farther you go from the actor, the farther you go from theatre. It may be possible that we can make a theatre only of technical things, but that is quite another thing. Then we are constructing, as creative constructors. But, of course, to come back to the beginning, it depends on the play and on the performance what you can do. Of course, you can use the technical means in contradiction to the play. You can do it, but I'm afraid of it, and I don't like it.

. . .

Spaic: Today, we still depend in the theatre on the spoken word. Now, the question is, how much does the quantity of the whole electronic means and facilities that we have today influence the spoken word? In other words, do all these electronic facilities that we have at our disposal today give a new content? Do electronic devices change the very nature of the spoken word?

Vessey: I just want to ask a question of Mr. Spaic. You did *Godot* on a desert isle in the hot sand. But I know the play. It's a rather intimate play. You used microphones.

Spaic: We could do it naturally, without using microphones, but to use microphones would just be amplifying. I've tried to go much deeper with my question.

Malpas: I would like to ask a question, too. When you talk about the nature of the spoken word, are you referring to the meaning of the spoken word, or to its content, within, say, a rhythmic framework, or a musical framework, or what?

Spaic: I will try to explain what I mean. You see, today, I think we are living in an era of the spoken word. Through the electronic means at our disposition we can communicate verbally through space. We can be illiterate and can communicate orally over great distances. We are exposed today to the spoken word as men never were in history before. We cannot get away from television broadcasts, walkie-talkies. Young people are exposed to the word twenty-four hours a day. And I think that it's changed the meaning of the word. So this is my question. In the theatre, today, what's happening? In the theatre of the absurd the spoken word is losing its value. It has become a currency without the gold in the bank. The enormous quantity of these bank notes and words that we are printing makes them lose their value.

Gaiser: Are we speaking of McLuhan's *The Medium is the Message*? That is, are we saying that the whole nature of the proliferation of technological facilities is bringing us suddenly to a different level in communication?

Madden: Is it possible that movement is then taking the place of some of these words?

Spaic: I think that gesture becomes very important, gesture as an expression.

Madden: I mean more than this. I mean total movement—and a great deal of movement through space, the total body, traveling through space.

Spaic: I would just like to answer the gentleman who asked about McLuhan. Until I arrived in this country some months ago, I did not know about this book. It's completely unknown in Yugoslavia, but, if he says the same things, I agree. I don't know.

Hoffman: I can interpose here, as Chairman, that certainly it is almost impossible to have any kind of discussion in the arts, or almost any subject, these days, without raising the question of McLuhanism. I think the area that we are facing now has to do with the breakdown of the regular function of language. The question that has been posed relates very closely to the general question of what kinds of experience are now being communicated through the arts. I was going to ask Mr. Schechner to set, perhaps, a little groundwork here.

Schechner: Well, I would like to make what I think is an important footnote comment, first, starting with what Mr. Spaic said about words losing their gold in the bank. I think it is intricately and deeply involved with a political experience that has been accumulating over a number of years but that has certainly come to a head in almost all highly industrialized nations. I cannot connect it, precisely, but I am convinced that there is this connection: politics and the lies of politicians are associated with bargaining tables, with words, with propaganda, with the kind of political assumption that events can be changed by words. These words are then pitted against the technology. No matter what the State Department, for example, may say about the war in Vietnam, one can turn on the TV set and watch it and draw certain conclusions. No matter what a government

may say about its actions, the actions are available through this technology. And the currency has been transferred by many people to this technology, which seems to be more solid, more substantial, more available, or more reliable than speech. The very money that you say is withdrawn from language is placed in gestures. And so one watches rather than listens. And I think that somehow that experience is central to what we are talking about.

Hoffman: It would seem to me, with regard to the theatre, that we do have a very specific question here; that is, if the emphasis and the concentration of experience is on the visual, is it to be communicated by what we could normally call scenery, or is it to be communicated still by what might be called movement or gesture involving the human body of the actor? For me, this passivity of experience that Mr. Schechner was referring to is certainly interesting, when I look at the experience of the young people in this country. For instance, I know that rock-and-roll music now comes equipped with flashing psychedelic pictures projected on the wall. The music itself is so amplified as to almost burst your eardrums, and, while there seems to be frequently a frenzy in the presentation, the reaction of the young dancers is hardly that of dance. They stand almost still and gyrate the body. If one attends any of the events in which this new music is played for the young people of America, one sees a picture of them with waves of sound, music, light coming upon them, as they retreat to some sort of womb-like situation.

Madden: I just wanted to add that that is really going back to what you would call tribal movement. You move together. You actually come with somebody, but nobody really knows it, as you watch all of this kind of movement from the young people. It is really very similar to primitive societies when they wish to come together for a kind of communal, spiritual ecstasy which is heightened by drums or music, becoming louder and louder as the dance becomes more and more ecstatic, with a chance, of course, for creative expression.

Schechner: As you move into that area, doesn't this get very central to what we're talking about—that words must be sequential to make sense and that they must go one at a time to make sense, but that images and movement must be simultaneous and complicated and multi-directional to make sense? Once the focus of the theatrical experience moves somewhere between words as a set of actions and words as an undifferentiated part of a whole towards this image situation, then we normally would expect to get a more complicated image and a more simultaneous image of events.

Madden: Yes, it almost seems to be a kind of hunger for all of these things which somehow must have been lacking—the desire for a terrific sound experience, a terrific movement experience, a terrific color experience—and there has been such a hunger for this that it has happened all at once. It is very much like the Renaissance, isn't it, when everyone had to stuff themselves with things which had been lacking because of denial of the church discipline? I am not saying that it is church discipline, but somehow we have developed this terrific hunger for motion and sound and color.

Baker: I think the McLuhan book was absolutely about McLuhan. As I understand the McLuhan concept, part of it is that there is a separation between the Gutenberg man and men today. Then, everything was divided into compart-

ments, in sequence, in order. Education was divided into compartments, knowledge was divided into compartments, with science separated from the arts, and so forth. This period has passed, now, and we have this concept of simultaneity that dictates the kind of theatre we will have. I think the proscenium theatre is the Gutenberg theatre; it is a one-perspective theatre. You see it from one viewpoint, usually from the eyes of the director. I think that the new kind of theatre we are talking about is a complete negation of the Gutenberg man, who was cool, aloof, reserved, detached. The very opposite of that is the man of the present-day electronic age, in which a whole world practically becomes a village, and in which the primitive senses are used as the Gutenberg man used the word. Contemporary theatre, contemporary music, contemporary art are a negation of all that, and the more they negate it, the more people like it. Our whole educational method is to think as they did in the Gutenberg period, but the young people of the electronic age not living there, nor does it have any real meaning to them. It seems to me that our architecture, our theatre architecture, our theatre thinking, has to move from the Gutenberg period into the electronic period and, starting from that assumption, develop a theatre or an architecture or a concept which will permit an enormous flexibility.

Gaiser: This would seem to be not unlike the kind of development from the Nineteenth to the Twentieth Century, where the theatre gradually became much more unified, insofar as direction is concerned, and the director emerged, and where style finally became more unified or, shall we say, eclectic. Choose what style you need for what you produce.

Now you are saying that insofar as the shift from the Gutenberg man to the modern man is concerned, you are getting another kind of development in which the theatre now—not only in terms of style, but of the various production elements—is getting to still another level where various means are coalescing and becoming integrated because technology is enlarging the potentiality of theatre, making it many-faceted and much richer.

Baker: I think we should be communicating with as much force in terms of movement, sound, color—of all technical means—as we used to communicate with the word. We have spent most of our lives with the word, and I think that from now on, although the word will still be there, we have to develop in all the other areas with the same amount of strength, artistry, and creativity. I am sure the young people will move into this with twice the ease that we have.

Hoffman: It seems to me that our discussion has come to the question of artistic choices, and it is also related to what we do to audiences. I am struck by another kind of distinction. When Dorothy Madden spoke of the new tribalism, she was, it seemed to me, referring to what could be called the collective experience, the relationship between an audience and—in the theatre—a performance, in a way that is immediate and that involves the audience. Some theatre is moving in this direction. On the other hand, one of the side effects of the new technology is the choice by the artist—in this case the theatre performer—of using materials which are available for assaulting the audience. How much do we have, today, of an audience's sharing, and how much do we have of the artist's working on the audience? I think this is not unrelated to the question of the word because behind all this discussion is the problem of either

taking the text and presenting it in a particular kind of way, or using the new particular ways to create an experience that is analogous to the text, which involves dropping the text.

Wim Vesseur Propounds a Heresey

Spaic: I would not dare to re-write Chekov or Shakespeare.

Vesseur: Shakespeare, in his time, did nothing else. He re-wrote old plays. Molière did the same. Molière said, "Je prends mon bien ou je le trouve." Why not? I agree that you can't make a rule out of it, but why should it be forbidden? When you have the idea that for the people of your time you can give the play in a better form, or with a better text than it had, and you cannot write new plays that are as good, then why not change it? What we have to do is to make theatre, not to respect a classic.

Spaic: But how can you say, "I am a better poet than Shakespeare?"

Vesseur: You cannot. You say you are a different poet.

Spaic: Can you say, "I will write a new play but not change the poetry of Shakespeare?"

Schechner: It is not a question of whether Shakespeare will survive your re-writing him. It is not a rewriting of the text. As Grotowski and some others do, it is a rearrangement of the scenic element. In other words, Grotowski added no lines to *Dr. Faustus*. He took no lines away. But he did essentially what Picasso did to classical art. He collaged it. He rearranged the elements in it. I think it is extraordinarily reactionary that in the theatre we don't take the same attitude towards the material that painters have been taking for fifty years, and that musicians have taken forever.

Spaic: No, no, no! You are not speaking about the same thing. Brecht rewrote classics. He wrote new scenes, new words. What you cannot do is to change the words of a playwright.

Hoffman: I am going to intervene just a moment. There are several points, perhaps, that can be made. Brecht also took Marlowe, and I, for one, believe there may be some point in thinking that his *Edward the Second* is better than Marlowe's. But the point is that Brecht was a genuine and major playwright and poet, and perhaps he had every right to do what Molière and perhaps Shakespeare did with older texts. The other question to ask is whether it is not possible that in directing a play, however faithful to the text you may be, you will impose just as many extra and outside meanings as Grotowski or anyone else does, by scrambling and adjusting the old text?

Spaic: I hope I did. But I respected the lines.

Schechner: It doesn't seem to me to be a question of rewriting the text. That's just a side issue. No one is going to rewrite *Hamlet* and make it better than *Hamlet*. Scenic reorganization begins, of course, with the old technology that we have available, but now as we learn to use the new devices and put the scenes in different relations, run them simultaneously, we continue the scenic revolution that began thirty or forty years ago. It leads to a complete and total reinterpretation of the old texts.

Baker: I don't think that it is just scenic. I don't see why I can't take *Hamlet* and treat it the same way that a musician would take an old piece and do what-

ever he wants to do with the themes. I have done this. I have tried to find the essential statements which *Hamlet* makes to me, as a West Texan—which probably would seem completely illiterate to a lot of people. But I had to find something that speaks to me. Why can't I take it? Who is to say I should not do to a play what a jazz musician would do to a piece of jazz, with themes and repeated ideas, repeating lines if I like, and trying to come up with the essence of what I felt. This is not to say I am superior to Shakespeare in any way. It is merely to say that he is great enough to inspire a group of people to work together and find whole new statements.

Technology and the Death of Heroes

Spaic: Today we can be more theatrical in the theatre and in our scenery because we do not need to imitate the empirical world of nature. This may seem to be a paradox, since, with all the facilities we have today, with new materials for building scenery, with projection, with sound, and so on, we could imitate the empirical world better than ever. At the same time, it would be absurd to do so in the theatre. And so I say that we can be more theatrical than ever from the point of view of the visual perception.

Still, the basic question for the contemporary theatre is whether we have a vision of the contemporary hero, of Man, as every period has had in the theatre. What is our contemporary hero? Connected with this question is another: Is tragedy, in the Aristotelian sense, possible today? This is, I think, linked with our visual perception of the world. I think this is the basic question we have to answer, or try to answer, if we want to know what contemporary theatre is.

Gaiser: Are you speaking of the modern repertoire?

Spaic: I am speaking about the contemporary, the living theatre, and not about directing Shakespeare or the classics.

Gaiser: As a case in point, a play like Miller's *The Crucible* definitely evokes the classical, Aristotelian response from the audience.

Spaic: I translated *The Crucible* and directed it. It is an excellent play. But I am speaking now about how men are changing in the electronic era.

Schechner: The impact of technology makes the modern theatre search for contradictory, ironic, and complicated images which, in a sense, stand apart and against the whole notion of the single hero. The hero has become an archaic, romantic figure which does not satisfy great needs. Instead, the theatre somehow is able to deal with more complicated issues, in a more ironic, or comic way. I don't think it is any accident that when Grotowski takes a *Dr. Faustus* he turns tragedy into comedy. Whatever new theatrical experiences we have had in the last fifteen years have been largely comic. When a play with a hero—such as *The Crucible*, or *A Man for All Seasons*—comes along, we say "How nice, but how archaic," simply because it takes a Hollywood point of view towards the hero. *A Man for All Seasons* makes a good film, naturally, but it seems hopelessly irrelevant to our normal, everyday experience and to what the theatre might do. You see the point I am driving at? It is not a point that would diminish the theatre. The theatre has not been squeezed out of the hero business, but the whole range of electronic communication has simply made heroes irrelevant.

For example, let us take state-craft. I imagine that the Renaissance theatre depended a lot upon state-craft—the great heroes who were statesmen of one sort or another, kings, etc. But we do not recognize heroes, now, because we can see the United Nations, we can see Fedorenko and Goldberg arguing another cause, and we know that Fedorenko and Goldberg are not free themselves. They are not statesmen and heroes. They are taking orders from Moscow and Washington. We know that the people in Moscow and Washington are themselves trapped in their own businesses, and that international statesmen of great power are not so powerful. They are guided by circumstances in a way that Renaissance statesmen were not. The whole notion of the hero changes because of a “hot line,” an electronic communication which makes individual heroic activity by President Johnson or Premier Kosygin impossible. The whole notion of the hero changes in that kind of world.

Madden: Does what you have said mean—as Jacques Barzun says—that our art seems to be actually one of debunking, of giving clay feet to anyone who has been a hero, to anyone who may be “a great man?”

Schechner: I think what it means is that in heroic drama we watch an individual make a choice, or a series of choices, whereas in this new kind of drama of complexity we throw those choices to the audiences. Either the hero is made the victim of choices by his environment, or by means of a simultaneous setting we say to the audience, “You put together the set of events in any way you wish, and take them in any order you wish. The decisions are thrown back to you.” The hero no longer makes decisions but becomes part of the decision-making process which has exploded to include everyone in the auditorium. And naturally that leads to a certain debunking.

Hoffman: In talking about the existence of the hero in contemporary arts, I think Mr. Schechner is suggesting that media other than theatre have it in their power to present the individual on a large scale and in such a way that he gets into the fantasy or the imagination of masses of people, and that the theatre, having been reduced in size by this expansion of the other media, perhaps is no longer fully capable of putting the hero on the stage. At the same time, he seems to be suggesting that when it comes to a deeper kind of experience which involves choices, decisions, and so forth, it is also perfectly evident to reasonably intelligent audiences today that no single hero is possible.

Schechner: Right. But it is not a diminution of the theatre. The theatre is perhaps the only art form which inherently permits decision-making and that can change the shape of its form as it is going on. You cannot change the shape of a movie, no matter what you wish to do, nor of a painting. But the theatre allows the kind of participation and decision-making which can change the whole form of experience for the actor, for the designer, for the technician, or for the audience, as it is going on. Our responsibility in the theatre today is much greater than it was before.

Gaiser: Mr. Schechner, speaking of the international scene, made the point that all of this electronic facility that we have now has eliminated the human element, in a way. It has narrowed the possibility of human decision and responsibility. Individually, I think it has sharpened it because now we have shortened time and space, and it has given us many more responsibilities. We

are just not able to take advantage of them yet. But we have a potentiality for coming to a higher level, insofar as our response as human beings is concerned. Now we are not able to control it. Maybe in the future we will be able to control it much better. Similarly, in the theatre you have this same potentiality of ascending to another level, of having much greater complexity, and therefore flexibility, available. Whether we will ever be able to get an audience to participate, to make a decision in regard to a play, is another thing. But at least we will be able to present them with stimuli to which they can respond. It is going to border almost on chaos, as it frequently does in happenings, because we do not know enough about controlling a whole audience's response. And yet there is, I think, much more flexibility available now.

Hoffman: I think Mr. Schechner was talking about 1) the power of the individual in society and 2) the power of art to achieve its end by focusing on the individual. What he was suggesting is that with the disappearance of the individual figure in political action we have to find other means of changing society, or of dealing with mankind in the theatre. I would take it that in this discussion "human" refers to the experience of the audience and to our effect on the human experience. Is that acceptable?

Schechner: What I meant by the distinction is that just because a great figure loses the individual capacity to decide the fates of millions doesn't mean he is any less human. It may be much more human that he does not have the freedom; that we have no figure comparable to Richard III, no figure who can push the panic button, as it were; that it does take a group, and that the decisions and choices, because of electronic communication, are more evenly distributed. With a press corps which had hundreds of electronic means at its disposal, Richard III could not get away with it. The responsibility is shared by a group. It is less possible for an individual to make momentous decisions, but it is more possible for any number of individuals acting in concert to make choices.

Hoffman: I think what Mr. Spaic was trying to discuss concerns the theatre as an instrument of social action. It is interesting to me to note in this context the development of plays during the last twenty years. Certainly, the individual has disappeared. Many people in this country, for instance, would find Arthur Miller a reactionary playwright, however contemporary, liberal, and advanced his social views. I think many of the young people in America who are interested in the new kind of theatre are not interested in *The Crucible* or *Death of a Salesman*. I find, in looking at the most exciting events in the theatre in recent years, that there is a kind of dual tendency among both playwrights and directors. The first has to do with the attempt to place a great number of people on stage and to have a kind of diverse focus, so that the audience is almost forced to choose which area of the stage, which kind of action it wishes to concentrate on, and then it is almost assaulted out of that choice. A multiplicity of choices is made available, and the audience is left somewhat perplexed. But, at the same time, it has been obliged to reach some sort of conclusion. *Marat/Sade* in the Peter Brook production would seem to me to be a singular example of this, where one almost did not know where to look, or where one was not allowed to look. For all the selectivity of Brecht, this multiplicity is occasionally evident in his plays.

In another kind of theatre the individual has been treated in such a way that he is seen as a figure of changing nature, one who is changed by society. One can think of Brecht, who, in *Mann ist Mann*, for example, made an individual into a soldier by using costume. Again, in *Galileo*, the Pope starts out in his underwear and in the process of putting on the vestments of the Pope changes his political views completely and winds up allowing Galileo to be taken by the Inquisition. It seems to me that the same is true in a play like *Godot*, where the two tramps become universal figures and at the same time are presented in the theatrical style of vaudeville.

Even a seemingly classical director like Tyrone Guthrie has become famous for the mass picture that he presents on the stage, with the strange sweeping of people from various walks of life on to the stage in almost any play, so that you get a momentary image of society which frequently is very clear, very pointed, and often has a political point of view. It is almost as if Guthrie felt that the individual hero could no longer stand on the stage.

These instances seem to me to present a change in our attitudes towards the individual. The directors I have spoken of have essentially achieved their effects through the movement of human bodies on the stage, but I think the question also relates to the use of scenery. Some directors have found ways of using the human body as scenery to achieve a contemporary image.

Dr. Spaic understands the kinds of experiments that I was calling "a third kind of theatre for a second audience" yesterday. To make a brief survey of the so called "third theatre," or new theatre, or whatever you want to call it, I could begin by describing a strange afternoon in the life of my own program at New York University. I will try to be sociological about it, as well as artistic. During the past six months we have had the honor of having on our faculty the English playwright, John Arden. I don't know how many of you are familiar with his work. His best-known play seems to be *Serjeant Musgrave's Dance*. Mr. Arden as a writer is deeply concerned with social problems, but he has a strange attitude towards them in that he is not doctrinaire. Rather, he is concerned with exposing the bases of human choices in times of stress and with trying to say something about human nature. His politics are generally what are called—at least in the Anglo-American world—"left-wing." Mr. Arden taught a conventional academic course which I think was called "Politics and Drama," or "Social Life and Drama." He offered a section of it to the acting students of our program and soon tried to convert it into an improvisational seminar. He does not have a thorough experience in the theatre either as an actor or as a director, and I take it that he has had considerable difficulty, at times, in dealing with both species. But he had an idea of extended theatre.

He started by asking why a play should go on for only a limited number of hours and why, if it plays longer, it should be an enlargement of the conventional play. He joined, I think, various other British colleagues, such as Joan Littlewood and Arnold Wesker, in the idea that theatre should be a form of social entertainment, in which the audience has a choice of wandering around, of seeing things, in fragments, if they choose, or serially, or of having an opportunity to go and eat when it wants.

Having inflamed our students, he proceeded to have something that was to be

called *War Game*. It was to occur over a period of twelve hours. It was to take place in our theatre, which is small, totally flexible, and capable of having the stage and seats moved anywhere. In this case, he proposed merely to clear it and create a room. What Mr. Arden apparently had in mind was that he would make up a plot, which would be developed by improvisation in rehearsals to a point where the students could keep playing through the course of the day. I think in the end it has twenty-three episodes. It was somewhat implausible and had, I think, that strange arrogance that comes when foreigners assume they know something about American life, particularly the life of places where they have never been. At any rate, it involved some hillbillies in Kentucky who are exposed to an accidentally detonated hydrogen bomb and who suffer from some strange skin disease. As it evolved, we saw the subsequent efforts of the government to conceal these matters, to bribe the people, and so forth. This was tied into a Hollywood-type plot in which the members of the family would gradually take over America. At least it appealed to the fancy of the students, and they went about rehearsing it. At the same time, there were to be interspersed events. Various theatre groups were invited to come in and do their bits, and singing groups were brought in.

The whole afternoon began with a series of competitive games—as at an amusement park—with prizes to be won (usually some kind of punishment for the audience). And there was a standard kind of war game in which two armies would parade around until they stopped on certain squares. At that point, two combatants were chosen who would then be forced to play a kind of game until one of them was declared dead.

So, we had this anti-war play going on while the audience was asked to make themselves into arrogant, fighting armies.

I have left out things about the decor, and the fact that the audience came in and went out at will. There were always at least one hundred people there, and at one point something like three hundred.

It wound up with a great peroration from Mr. Arden, in which he declared that the Gods are dead, the Leaders are dead, that we must somehow or other have Peace. It was not very convincing. And he was speaking, of course, to an audience which was as devoted to peace as he. There was, I thought, a general sense of joy, or pleasure, throughout the whole afternoon. It was a sermon, preached to the converted, and there were, for me, moments of acute boredom which the general audience did not share. But the afternoon went off without incident.

I have described this at some length to suggest it as representative of a certain trend in theatre in this country. To my mind, a happening that Mr. Schechner conducted with two colleagues in New Orleans, last year, was far more interesting, far more exciting, and perhaps even better for society than Mr. Arden's attempt at an entertaining and artistic sort of propaganda. Whether this is theatre, whether this is an attempt to involve people in a proper fashion, I don't know. I simply throw it at you to open discussion.

Baker: I would like to make a few comments about this. I certainly think that this has a place in theatre. Whenever we can bring flexibility to any of our programs in theatre, or to any of our life in the theatre, we should do so. This is

another way of growing and learning. Perhaps whole new relationships in communication will be discovered this way. I am always interested in what is the best kind of communication, and certainly this would reach a group.

We once took the novel, *Of Time and the River*, which consists of one thousand pages, and divided it up into sections of about fifty pages each, gave them to groups of people, and had them work about five hours on their sections, then enact them. We acted the novel over five Saturdays, and then came back and began to give form to it. Finally, we got a three-hour production out of it. This was exciting, and a lot of playwrights have evolved out of it. We have worked in many, many different ways.

Sometimes, I feel that we have elevated the playwright to a pinnacle where he has become in some ways a highly nervous, quite often difficult person. He has put himself in an ivory tower where he does not work with actors, directors, or anyone, anymore. He feels everything he writes is sacred. I think this kind of thing helps to break down the isolation of the playwright.

We have five or six writers working with us all the time. Next week, we open a play that we wrote as we worked, in a loose kind of way, with impromptu sketches, using television screens, mirrors, all kinds of things. Some sections of the play will be impromptu, different every night, and it will involve the audience. I think this is a valuable loosening up of theatre, from which we may find some real truths.

What bothers me about it, of course, is that they start out on a theme. I wonder if the actors who are working in this way really have a belief in what they do, or if they are being led down a blind alley, like the animals that followed Henny Penny across the street and the world fell on them. I often feel that there is a certain dishonesty and lack of real belief. One or two smart guys can lead them anywhere they want to, unfortunately, and give the whole thing an ugly, amateurish quality. I don't mind the amateurish quality, but I do mind the dishonesty when actors mouthe things because two or three people with some leadership indicate to them that this is what they should do.

I don't mind this in a play. They have studied the play, and they have all arrived at a certain kind of relationship to the facts of the play, and to the ideas of the play. But I resent basic dishonesty on the part of those who assume leadership which is fake and cheap. I don't know how you are going to get around this, unless you have long discussions in advance about it, so that each actor can express himself. In other words, this would make each performer into a philosopher, a sociologist, a psychiatrist. He would have to be a really superior person.

Technology in the Age of Analysis
a meditation by Mr. Kosta Spaic

Spaic: Our panel is discussing scene design in connection with technology. The word "technology" needs fuller explanation. Do we mean only a better lighting system or the use of electronic machines in the theatre? Earlier I tried to explain the word, but I am afraid I haven't done well, so I will try to do it now.

I am more concerned with what the development of science, especially physics has done to our vision of the world. Through the development of industrial

production, what is science doing to the relation between human beings? I think we can be objective in stating that the development of science in this era is changing, *basically changing*, our vision of the world and the relationship between men and men. This is a fact which could be described further, but the fact has consequences in art.

We cannot make a final statement about the consequences. We are in a forest, and cannot see objectively. We are in a very difficult position to describe the influence of technology not only on theatre but on music, literature, sculpture and painting. The new tendencies in these arts, which have something in common, reflect the new conception, the new vision of the world. We are now, I think, in an era when artists try in every field to find out the nature of the material they are working with. In music, the composers are not satisfied any more with the classical sound as a raw material of their art. They try to analyze the very nature of the sound, to discover the different levels of the sound. So it is an analysis: we are in a period of analysis.

The same thing—exploration and discovery as a result of the new vision of science—has happened in literature. The Word is a raw material of literature which is now being studied as the symbol of message, as the symbol of communication and expression. The word is split into atoms, as an element of language. Every artist goes into a microcosmos, trying to discover the microcosmos of his material. And what is happening seems to me to be the result of the big, fundamental discoveries in science. There is an atmosphere in which artists live today which creates something in common between the tendency to build a multipurpose theatre and the tendencies in music where musicians are no longer satisfied with the conventional instruments they have used for centuries to express themselves. All the things we have aimed at and that we see are happening are the result of the new discoveries technology, in this sense, has made.

*Discussion of the Dialogue,
An Overview of the Conference*

JACK MORRISON

ANY CONSIDERATION OF THIS REPORT MUST FIRST RECOGNIZE THE EXHILARATING, even heady atmosphere the delegates generated in the conference rooms of the Department of State. The prevailing spirit at the outset was one only made possible by devoted colleagues committed to their profession. It was free, direct and penetrating. Many volunteered that this was the first international conference in their experience fashioned in such a way as to allow for extensive dialogue in some depth. It was in this sort of atmosphere, then, that a kind of study in comparative theatre developed. The dialogue, as the reader has discovered, provides much information about certain topics from many quarters of the globe. More than that, the dialogue suggests the development of comparative theatre, the possibility of other future investigations, relates to studies of current interest, and points to specific areas for productive research. This discussion, therefore, is not a "summary" in any sense but is intended to indicate some of the ideas which may relate to other studies such as the *Educational Theatre Journal's* special issue, "Conference on Theatre Research" (1967) or may introduce some ideas for future research.

Stanislavski is obviously alive and well and living in Yugoslavia, New York, Korea, Belgium, Russia and Chile, but not, emphatically not, in Seattle, Washington, according to Ralph Allen's report of Group I. Duncan Ross, the Gladiator from Seattle and points north and east, challenged the field of Stanislavski supporters with his "organic" approach to acting. His development of his Postscript to Group I, "Towards an Organic Approach to Actor Training: A Criticism of the Stanislavski Scheme," is an extension of his thinking expressed earlier in the *Educational Theatre Journal* (1966), "Relationships between the Educational and Professional Theatre" and is based on extremely interesting and provocative philosophical, physiological and psychological concepts. There is a rich motherlode of ideas here for research and study as René Hainaux makes clear in his Group I Postscript. But how do we get to it? Is there a choice between mystique and method? The dialogue from Group I is a guaranteed antidote to complacency. Every teacher of acting should read it. Tsarev's describing the course of study leading to the "General Technical Engineer of Theatrical Affairs" will interest all of those who are producing technicians.

Group II spent much time identifying just what an audience—a theatrical audience—is. The identity of the audience began to be defined in terms of the artistic purpose of a given theatre in a given country, and the concepts of the relationship of the audience to the theatrical event vary interestingly. Boredom

in the theatre is the devil of the day, and the search for vitality in the theatre is the challenge. In any case, all agreed that the child should have the opportunity to witness and participate in theatre in every country. Differences between a youth theatre (for ages 12-17) and an adult theatre are pursued. Certainly, a student interested in audience research can get an excellent view of the multi-factored nature of the problem from this dialogue. Milan Lukes' postscript contributes a thoughtful approach of a "bi-lateral process" between the theatre and its public. This is meat for those who may be interested in building a model for this kind of theatre research. Ferenc Hont provides some hard news about "Theatre and Public in Hungary." It should be stimulating to those developing regional theatres in North America.

An exploration of artistic leadership by Group III disclosed the fact that definition in this area is sorely lacking and the need for study, clarification and understanding is great. The relationship of the "artistic leader" to his art, his board, his company and his public was discussed and described in some detail. The material here begs for systematic study. Each country seems to be baffled by the problem of how to develop "artistic leadership." Its difficulty is only matched by its seriousness. Group III certainly makes it clear that backing off the problem will not solve it and that every force available for designing a process which would select and educate such people should be encouraged and employed. The theatre must work with educators more effectively to devise new ways for providing a favorable climate for the nurture of artistic leaders.

Group IV, "Theatre in the Education Process" introduces a number of short "Postscripts" which offer a beginning for studies in comparative theatre education in the schools with statements from Japan, East Germany, Iran, Korea, Ceylon, The Philippines, Uganda, and the United States. This is the first statement of its kind that I know of, and I suggest that students of educational theatre may find this material valuable to their work. In the report of the dialogue, delegates of vastly different background disagreed little about educational and cultural goals. Those educators interested in articulating the curriculum from nursery school ages on up will find this material helpful. It was strongly felt that theatre is an effective instrument for international understanding. It would be interesting to see if experiments could be devised to test the validity of this strong opinion among the delegates.

Group V, "Improving Design for the Technical Function," discovered itself exploring the limits technology has shattered for the theatre and what technology—philosophically—has done to architectural form. The discussion runs from the physical structure to found space with all that can be put in between, including television. The effects of this on the text as well as scene design is presented and begins to put the dialogue at the cutting edge of theatre research ala Grotowski and Peter Brook. The generation of theatre workers under 30 will find this is the dialogue to be dug. Postscripts by Gaiser, Risser and Koizumi give attention to technical problems from a somewhat more conventional point of view. And Gaiser, particularly, calls for more direction "to work out of the chaos of the abundance of things." Whether it takes a philosopher or an artist to "work" his way in performance towards the new directions doesn't matter so

much as facing up to the problems. This dialogue should serve to put some handles on those problems for those who wish to grapple with them.

Appendix is a dull word, usually employed as a catch-all for material the editor couldn't relate to the text and somehow couldn't leave out. But Travis Bogard, the Editor of this report, has contributed a dazzling "appendix" composed of captured dialogue from the tapes originally recorded in various languages. It's as if the body of the report were created to set up the scene for "Soliloquies and Passages-at-Arms: A Selection of High Spots, Transcribed from the Recordings of the Conference." It provides the background for enjoying and appreciating the deep commitment, vast knowledge and experience of the delegates. Their sincere and telling effort to contribute to the understanding of the theatre, and therefore, our ability to teach it, is a significant contribution to education.

The dialogue gives some of the flavor of the exchange that went on during these times. The material here is as diverse as it is stimulating, and I can but say that the only students, teachers and workers in the theatre who do not find the excerpts stimulating and suggestive for thought, study and action are dead. It's the kind of dialogue that arises only from a conference like this. For example, there is the dialogue termed, "The Sense of the Ghetto in American Negro Theatre" in which the views of an American Negro and some of the foreign visitors sharply clash. It is remarkable how deeply the foreign guests felt on the matter of the American Negro developing his own theatre rather than being taught to espouse a theatre of European tradition. Here an important issue for educational theatre is sharply delineated and begs for more consideration. And in Alkazi's discourse on the demands for artistic leadership in an emerging country with great and delicate sophistication combined with a kind of primitive need for theatre lived in the streets, we have a brilliant, moving description of the problem we all face in making the theatre meaningful to all segments of society. Further, the deeper meanings of technology in the McLuhan sense are debated with extraordinary persuasion and expertise in the Schechner-Tovstonogov Waltz and the Hoffman-Madden Pas-de-deux on movement. Kosta Spaic's meditation on "Technology in the Age of Analysis" focuses on a basic change in theatrical vision.

In short, the delegates took the charge of the Conference in their teeth. They exchanged views in the fullest sense of increasing their theatrical consciousness. I believe this Conference and its report will go far to encourage a comparative approach to theatrical problems, and this, in turn, will contribute to theatre as a more effective force in education and education as a more effective force in theatre.